LOYOLA UNIVERSITY CHICAGO 1870 AD MAJOREM DEI GLORIAM eCOMMONS

Loyola University Chicago
Loyola eCommons

Dissertations | Theses and Dissertations

1991

An Analysis of Charles Allen Prosser's Conception of Secondary Education in the United States

Roberta Silver
Loyola University Chicago

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss

 Part of the Education Commons

Recommended Citation

Silver, Roberta, "An Analysis of Charles Allen Prosser's Conception of Secondary Education in the United States" (1991). *Dissertations*. 2890.
https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss/2890

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact ecommons@luc.edu.

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License.
Copyright © 1991 Roberta Silver

AN ANALYSIS OF CHARLES ALLEN PROSSER'S CONCEPTION OF SECONDARY EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES

by

Roberta Silver

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of Loyola University of Chicago in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

January

1991

Copyright by Roberta Silver, January 1991
All Rights Reserved

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It is my pleasure to recognize those individuals who provided assistance and support during the development of this study. Contributions of this nature are forever valued.

I am extremely grateful to Dr. Gerald Gutek, director of this thesis, for his encouragement, advice and editorial skills. I am also appreciative of the wise counsel provided by committee members, Doctors Joan Smith and John Wozniak.

Special thanks are afforded to Joe Orth, Inter-library Loan Assistant at Loyola University. His persistent efforts in obtaining requested materials always resulted in success. Gratitude is extended to Dr. James Bensen, President, Dunwoody Industrial Institute, for allowing me access to previously unpublished documents. Similarly, to Lori Caouette, who offered invaluable help in collecting these materials.

Finally, I am deeply indebted to my very dear family for their ceaseless confidence in my work. Special thanks are reserved for my parents who taught me the value, satisfaction, and joy that results from attainment of goals.

VITA

The author, Roberta Silver, is the daughter of Ruben and Gladys (Jacobs) Silver. She was born November 28, 1951 in Chicago, Illinois.

Ms. Silver obtained her elementary and secondary education in the public schools of Chicago. She attended Sullivan High School from which she graduated in 1969.

In September, 1969, Ms. Silver entered Northern Illinois University, receiving the degree of Bachelor of Science in Speech Pathology and Audiology in January, 1973. The degree of Master of Arts in Speech Pathology was awarded to her by that same university in May, 1974.

Since 1974, Ms. Silver has been employed as a Speech-Language Pathologist in the Chicago Public Schools. In 1983, she was appointed Lead Speech Pathologist for Sub-District Two of the Chicago school system, a position she currently maintains.

PREFACE

Charles Prosser, a prominent vocational educator, rose to national attention in 1945 when he called upon the United States Commission of Education to offer life adjustment training for those students whose needs were not being met in the traditional high school program. His proposal, known as the `Prosser Resolution', became a rallying cry around which a popular, yet, controversial attempt was made to revise the secondary school curriculum. Although Prosser's formal involvement in the movement ceased at this juncture, it is to life adjustment education that his name is most commonly, and often derisively, associated.

Prosser's life was dedicated to the promotion of vocational education programs and inculcation of similar principles into the secondary curriculum. Surprisingly, while several articles have been written about Prosser's work in vocational education, a comprehensive study, centering on his views of secondary education has never been undertaken. It is for these reasons this research is being conducted.

This dissertation examines Charles Allen Prosser's ideas of secondary education regarding curriculum and instruction. It also encompasses his thoughts on vocational and life adjustment education. Prosser's belief in the necessity of providing alternative educational avenues for those not benefitting from a liberal academic track will be

investigated. Through this conceptual analysis of Prosser's ideas on secondary education in the United States, the development of his educational theory will be isolated. The researcher will attempt to answer the following focusing questions: 1. Did Prosser have a philosophy of secondary education? 2. What factors influenced the development of his educational ideas? 3. How did his ideas on secondary education contribute to school curriculum? 4. What was Prosser's significance as an educator? The answers to these questions will provide the essence of this dissertation and offer the educational views of this controversial educator.

It is the thesis of this study that Charles Prosser did develop a distinct and cohesive philosophy of education that he applied to both vocational and general education areas. To validate this assumption, Prosser's publications as well as unpublished documents and speeches have been examined. The research technique employed was the historical procedure utilizing a documentary research method. Prosser's writings and speeches were extensive and analyzing this material proved the most difficult phase of this study.

Within this study certain terms require definition. Secondary education refers to high school grades nine through twelve -- the delineation adhered to by Prosser. Vocational education refers to those studies with the primary goal of job preparation. All other explanations of terminology are

included as part of the analysis of Prosser's educational ideology.

This study is limited to Prosser's concept of education solely in regard to secondary education. No attempt is made to discuss his ideas of vocational training programs for adults. Also, only a cursory treatment of biographical information is included. This background information will serve to provide the reader with a perspective from which to view major events in Prosser's life and the ideas that emerged as a result.

Ideas similar to those proposed by Prosser are still debated today. It is hoped that this examination of Prosser's ideas and concerns will not only elucidate his position in secondary education, but add clarity to current discussions.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CONTENTS OF APPENDICES

CHAPTER I

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

The period surrounding Charles Allen Prosser's life was one of change within the United States. In the years from 1870 to 1920, America was shifting from an agrarian to an industrial society. The abundance of natural resources, the population shift from rural to urban areas, as well as the influx of immigrants from Southern and Eastern Europe, all helped fuel this change in society. As an accelerant were local and federal policies established to promote industrialization.

The United States was emerging as a world power but not without incurring internal stresses. The progressive era, from 1900 to 1920, set reform measures into motion to resolve economic, political and social concerns that resulted from urbanization and modernization. Anti-trust laws were enacted to modify the concentration of wealth. Political reforms were sought to encourage participatory government and seek an end to corruption. Conservationists secured legislation to limit the environmental harm created by unchecked industrialization. Social minded reformers pursued policies and programs to improve housing and health-care facilities for immigrants. The progressive

movement in education stimulated reforms that continued into the 1950s.

The early decades of the twentieth century saw renewed debate over the purpose of education. Massive urbanization and industrialization resulted not only in overcrowded schools but brought concern regarding the adequacies of the curriculum to prepare a skilled work force. The advent of "modern" psychology created more questions: Were courses to be taught as a means of mental discipline? Did transfer of training exist? Should all students study the same subjects regardless of interest or ability levels? How best could the schools function as egalitarian institutions?

It was during this period of time that Charles Allen Prosser developed his ideas concerning secondary education. It is in light of these events that his life is explored.

Early Years

A first generation American, Charles Allen Prosser was born in New Albany, Indiana on September 20, 1871.[1] His father made his living working in a steel mill, where during the summers, Charles joined him. In addition, the elder Prosser served as a vice-president of the Amalgamated Association of Iron and Steel Workers. It is from this background that Charles developed his interests in the difficulties and concerns of the working man.[2] Prosser's formal education began in the public schools of New Albany.

Imbued by a sense, no doubt, of working hard in order to attain `the American Dream', Charles graduated with honors simultaneously from the local high school as well as the business college.[3] With some financial support from civic leaders, he was able to begin college at DePauw University, at Greencastle, Indiana, in the Fall of 1890.[4]

It was at DePauw that Prosser demonstrated his interest and skills in the art of oral persuasion. While a student he was "vice-president of the Interstate Oratorical association, composed of ten states; and winner of the first inter-collegiate debate between DePauw and Indiana universities."[5] Although an ambitious student, a continuing shortage of funds for tuition precluded graduation until 1897.[6]

While working to earn the money to complete his undergraduate degree, Prosser experienced his first taste of being an educator. For two years he served as an elementary school teacher. Then, during the period from 1896 to 1899, he taught physics, literature and chemistry at the high school level. In addition he assumed many administrative responsibilities.[7] In viewing Prosser's later career decisions, it can be concluded that his early teaching experiences, were positive ones. Although Prosser initially may have seen his life as leading in other directions, his affinity for the field of education would soon emerge.

While teaching in the local schools and attending DePauw, Prosser married Zerelda A. Huckeby, a kindergarten teacher, on December 30, 1896. Their son, William Lloyd, was born March 15, 1898.[8] Shortly before her marriage, the future Mrs. Prosser had visited kindergartens in various Chicago settlement houses--Hull House in particular. The poverty of the slum-residents had left in her a life-long desire to aid the poor.[9] This sense of mission, to aid the poor, was one which her husband was soon to share.

Graduation from DePauw in 1897, brought with it decisions to be made concerning a career.[10] Having the intention of entering the field of politics or law, Prosser chose the latter.[11] Most likely some encouragement from his father-in-law, an attorney, helped in coming to this determination. He entered the University of Louisville Law School upon the year following graduation. It was during this period that he again demonstrated his skills of written analysis and argument:

> While here he [Prosser] prepared a brief upon the notorious Kentucky law of self-defense which has been submitted by the dean of the school to the Supreme court of that commonwealth and pronounced by them as the ablest discussion of the question ever submitted.[12]

In later years, this expertise would prove invaluable to Prosser in the development and promotion of legislation for vocational education as well as in the advancement of his concept of secondary education. At the time, however, the benefits were not immediately visible. His career as an

attorney, to his devastation, was markedly unsuccessful and after a three-month period without having secured a single client, Prosser sought new career opportunities.[13]

A Career in Education

The same civic leaders that came to his financial aid when attending DePauw, again took Prosser under their wing. He was offered the superintendency of the New Albany Public Schools; a position which he readily accepted.[14] Although their motives remain unknown, the business leaders of New Albany may not have been acting entirely altruistically. Considering the varied responsibilities of the school superintendent, in Charles Prosser they found a man with teaching and administrative experience, oratorical skills as well as legislative knowledge.

The job of superintendent was apparently well-suited to Prosser. With characteristic vigor, his goal became that of making the New Albany Schools commensurate with school-systems nationwide. His reputation among his colleagues flourished and on December 29, 1902 he was selected President of the Indiana Teacher's Association, "The youngest man ever elected to the position. . . ."[15] It was at this point that Prosser was able to pair his political ambitions with those as an administrative and educational leader.

"Needed Re-Adjustment of Our School System" was the title of Prosser's inaugural address.[16] It was epochal

because several themes were touched upon that Prosser would continue to espouse throughout his long career. He issued a challenge to his audience, to end the domination of the universities in determining the curriculum for the elementary and secondary schools. He stated:

> By these same rigid entrance requirements the university has wittingly or unwittingly determined what and how 500 in the primary school, 250 in the grammar school and 125 in the secondary school shall be taught in order that ten of the number who are the favored children of fortune may be best prepared for the demands of a classical education and the struggle for a sheepskin.[17]

Prosser saw the survival of the Republic contingent upon an educated citizenry. Schools were not to serve as stepping stones to higher education. The universities were only of benefit to the select few choosing careers of politics or specific professions. A democracy called for education of the majority; students who needed to become self-sufficient, contented adults who would not become burdens on society. Prosser saw the purpose of education as preparation for life. This would be a theme he would extol until its culmination as the Life Adjustment Movement, occurring in the 1940s.

In this address, although Prosser did not specify exactly what subjects should be taught in the schools, he clearly stated those which were not of benefit to the many, i.e., the study of foreign languages:

> In all the past history of our educational system the fittest have been those who were able to

> pursue a foreign language successfully. As if only a knowledge of Greek verbs could make one a good citizen; as if only a mastery of Latin idioms could fit one for leadership among men; as if only an ability to converse in a European tongue could raise one to a higher plane of mental and spiritual life![18]

Prosser visualized a more broadly based, multifaceted curriculum; one not limited to the classics; a curriculum with practical applications for living. Through the years Prosser would expand and develop this theme. He demanded that utilitarian subjects be taught in high schools based on their content, carry-over and teaching value.

Another thread that emerged from this speech, one that would be woven into the fabric of Prosser's educational philosophy, was a concern about vocational education:

> If the many are to live completely, they must be successful workers within their industrial and social environment. To be out of harmony with the former is to be an incompetent or a failure; to be out of harmony with the latter is to be an ascetic or an anarchist!
>
> If the rural schools can not teach both agriculture and Latin, let them teach agriculture, for a knowledge of the science of farming is of more importance to the many who must work out their destiny amid the clover than the story of Caesar's operations against Helvetians.[19]

Prosser's ideas concerning vocational education were just at the point of genesis. In subsequent years, he would rally for `real' vocational education. Only through courses taught by those actually working in their field of expertise, as well as providing hands-on experience in working with current, up-to-date equipment, could true

vocational education occur. Prosser's tenacious work in this area would earn him credit as the father of the *Vocational Education Act of 1917 (Smith-Hughes Act)*--a far-reaching law that would dictate federal requirements and funding in this field until the 1960s.

In this address, as his first major statement of policy, Prosser essentially delineated his plan for secondary education, albeit, one that would take years to fully evolve. Contrary to previous interpretations, Charles Prosser's ideas concerning education did not emanate solely from his association with David Snedden, for he would first come in contact with Snedden in 1908. Prosser's ideas emerged as a consequence of his experiences and observations. The policies Prosser delineated to the Indiana State Teacher's Association, will be explored further in subsequent chapters.

Continuation of Formal Education

Prosser served as superintendent of the public schools in New Albany for eight years from 1900 to 1908.[20] While in this position he was appointed judge of the juvenile court where he served for five years, without remuneration. As an officer of the court, Prosser presided over cases involving students of his school system. H. A. Buerk (in an unpublished volume of testimonials to Prosser) stated that Prosser believed that the social adjustment of youths was the school's responsibility and grew dissatisfied with

the school system upon seeing these students enter into legal difficulties:

> His deep-seated conviction, that so far as the mass of our citizenship is concerned, the schools should at least train them in habits of thinking and doing the things which they must do all the days of their life, was intensified by his unique experience with dependent youth.[21]

Thus emerged another early aspect of Prosser's educational philosophy that would be cultivated in the convening years --that of habit formation.

In 1906 Prosser earned his master's degree from DePauw University.[22] For his thesis he examined the juvenile court movement. While serving as school superintendent, he received an honorary degree from Hanover College for contributions made to education.[23]

One year prior to earning his master's degree, Prosser collaborated with George B. Lockwood on the *New Harmony Movement* and was credited with preparing the educational chapters. This work provided a description and analysis of the communitarian social experiment attempted by Robert Owen and his colleagues at New Harmony, Indiana in 1825.[24]

The goal of New Harmony was social regeneration through the community and school. Although Owen's experiment was short-lived, Prosser identified the following educational achievements: the first infant school in America; the introduction of the kindergarten program as part of the public school; the first free public school system open to both boys and girls; establishment of the

industrial school as part of a free public school system. Prosser also lauded the founders of New Harmony for their rejection of the concept of a classical education as required for all students, regardless of abilities or desires. Not only was this an issue that he addressed when speaking to the Indiana State Teacher's Association, but one that he would maintain throughout his life-work.

The short-comings of the school system that Prosser perceived while serving as a juvenile court judge, led to his seeking a doctoral degree. Through this degree he hoped to better prepare himself to provide educational services to others.[25] Beginning September 15, 1908, the New Albany School Board granted Prosser a leave of absence to attend Columbia University, where he would study until 1910.[26] Continuing to demonstrate an interest in law while a student at Teachers College, Prosser served as superintendent and legal advisor for the Children's Aid Society in New York City.[27]

As part of his studies, Prosser took courses from Professors E. L. Thorndike and David Snedden.[28] Both were pivotal in the development of his philosophy of secondary education, including vocational education. Edward Thorndike is regarded as a leader in applying modern scientific principles to educational theory. Prior to his research, the prevailing view of learning was exemplified by policies delineated in 1828 by the Yale Faculty

Committee. Expanding on the theory that the mind's long-term capacity for knowledge could be enhanced through arduous mental exercises, they added that specific subjects, such as classical languages, philosophy, rhetoric, physical sciences and oratory, would discipline the mind.[29] Through the years questions arose as to which subjects would best enhance mental discipline. The Committee of Secondary Schools Studies was organized by the National Education Association, in 1892, to help clarify the issue. They confirmed that the purpose of education was in training the mind. They also, however, broadened the curriculum in the belief that other subjects could have disciplinary value, depending on the method of instruction.[30]

Simultaneous to the discussion of mental discipline was the concern regarding transfer of training. It was in this area Thorndike conducted his research. He found that transfer of training, from one task to another, did not occur in all cases. However, the likelihood of transference increased in direct proportion to the degree of similarity between the two tasks.[31] In Thorndike's work, Prosser found validation of his belief in the uselessness in studying subjects such as foreign languages, to strengthen the mind. For Prosser, Thorndike's research proved the merit of task specific training. Another

individual significant in the evolution of Prosser's educational convictions was David Snedden.

Professor Snedden was the person who Prosser credited in the acquisition of his social philosophy of vocational education.[32] Early in his career, Snedden proposed that the ultimate goal of education was in attaining the highest degree of efficiency. He deemed social control as necessary to achieve efficiency with the school as the best effector in securing this end.[33] Although not in total agreement with Snedden, Prosser found affirmation of his own belief that schools were instruments of society, that must train students for the profit of mankind.

Early Work in Vocational Education

Upon completion of his course work at Teachers College, Prosser was offered a new job, that of Deputy Commissioner of Industrial Education (as it was then termed) for the State of Massachusetts. Selected by David Snedden, newly appointed Commissioner of Education, Prosser's acceptance proved important and marked the onset of his life-long career in vocational education. This appointment spoke well of Snedden's estimation of Prosser's abilities. According to Snedden, Prosser proved to be "...a most loyal co-worker and a dynamic force in promoting the innovations expected by the leading citizens of Massachusetts under their newly enacted legislation."[34]

The legislation to which Snedden referred, resulted from the *Report of the Commission on Industrial and Technical Education.* Carroll D. Wright was chosen as chairman. The Commission's purpose was multi-fold. They were to query various industries as to their expectations of the schools in terms of providing job skills. They were then to ascertain how well the schools met these goals. Finally, the Commission was to provide any needed suggestions for changes in education.[35]

The Commission made several recommendations. In relation to the high schools, it was urged that the mathematics, science and drawing curricula be modified to demonstrate their practical applications. Most important to Prosser's career was the recommendation that a new commission be appointed to establish a dual educational system: one for industrial education and one maintaining the traditional course of study. Both school systems would operate separately, yet equally, within the State Board of Education.[36] Prosser agreed with this idea wholeheartedly. In a 1911 report to the National Society for the Promotion of Industrial Education, he declared:

> We need vocational schools, paralleling but not rivaling the high school, for those boys and girls over 14 years of age who can give from one to four years to vocational education that will fit them directly, first, for service, and later, for leadership in skilled callings.[37]

Thus, within the Massachusetts school system, Prosser was able to realize his goal of education as life preparedness,

along with emphasizing the need for a new educational model --one untarnished by the traditionalists.

Prosser worked indefatigably in promoting the establishment of vocational programs, as well as modifying the curriculum as needed. According to Snedden, "His missionary fervors made him something of a St. Paul."[38] His zealousness was not always appreciated and at times he appeared dogmatic.

Prosser experienced resistance from various educators to the new concept of vocational education as learning technical skills rather than the old views of it as manual training.[39] Prosser's opponents saw their view of vocational education already implemented in the schools. In contrast, Prosser saw manual training as synonymous with performance of handiwork and therefore not representative of learning skills necessary to keep pace with new technological developments. Deeper, perhaps, was Prosser's concern that manual training incorrectly reinforced the theories of mental powers and transfer of training--theories that he disavowed. Prosser's response to the opposition that he encountered from those in general education, was to become even firmer in his belief that only a dual system of education could bring about educational reform. Later, he would soften this position.

Secretary of NSPIE

Prosser served as Deputy Commissioner for two years and left in 1912 to assume the post of executive secretary of the National Society for the Promotion of Industrial Education (NSPIE).[40] The NSPIE was founded in 1906 as a means of unifying the diverse groups involved in vocational education: manufacturers, organized labor, and educators. Among their goals were those to advance state and federal legislation in vocational education and to modify existing educational systems in order to meet the *real* needs of students.[41]

In the ensuing years, inroads were made towards meeting both aims. It became apparent that the question was not one of *if* legislation would be enacted but one of *whose* version of vocational education legislation would be approved. The NSPIE had very definite concerns regarding: complete separation from higher education (they demanded this); appropriate teacher training (they felt Normal Schools were ill-prepared to handle this task); administration of funds (they wanted a national agency to ensure that monies were only provided for "genuine" vocational education).[42] With their goals so close to being met and yet in such peril, the NSPIE determined that they required a productive lobbying effort in Washington, along with continued work at the state level.[43] The selection of

Prosser as Secretary turned out to be a sage one. He was a powerful speaker and not only did he have a legal background but also political experience gained as Deputy Commissioner. Most importantly, Prosser and the NSPIE shared a similar vision of vocational education in relation to general education.

As Executive Secretary, Prosser criss-crossed the continent promoting state programs and funding for vocational education. In 1912 he formulated a policy statement concerning state legislative guidelines for such programs. Prosser emphasized the need for total separation of funding, administration, curriculum, and teacher-training between vocational and general education.[44] Through his efforts as a lobbyist, in 1914, Congress passed a joint resolution creating the National Commission on Aid to Vocational Education, to explore federal funding. The work of this commission would serve as the framework for the *Smith-Hughes Act*.

Charles Prosser was appointed to the commission. According to John A. Lapp, another member of the commission, Prosser was instrumental in selecting the remaining members.[45] The backgrounds of the appointees are of interest. The four congressional members, Senators Hoke Smith and Carroll Page and Representatives Fess and Hughes, all had pro-vocational education records. The balance of the group, Agnes Nestor, Charles Winslow, Florence

Marshall, and John Lapp, all came with backgrounds in industrial education or private industry.[46] The absence of representation from general education and underlying antipathy toward such (especially from Prosser) made the group's recommendations no surprise.

The Commission's suggestions were very similar to Prosser's recommendations in the past. They wanted national funding for teacher salaries and training as administered through a federal board. The public schools to be funded were not to include colleges. The schools would be "designed to prepare boys and girls over 14 years of age for useful or profitable employment in agriculture and in the trades and industries."[47] Also included in the report was a model for a bill that could be presented to Congress detailing the Commission's recommendations. With only slight modifications, it was this bill that became the *Smith-Hughes Act*, passed into law on February 23, 1917. By virtue of the fact that Prosser composed two-thirds of The Report on National Aid to Vocational Education, and this report served as the framework for the ensuing national act, credit is justifiably given to Prosser for writing this law.[48]

Director of Dunwoody

Charles Prosser completed his doctoral dissertation, and in 1915 was awarded the degree of doctor of philosophy from Teachers College, Columbia University. The title of

his treatise, *A Study of the Boston Mechanic Arts High School*, was presented as a report to the Boston School Committee, made at their request.[49] In the report Prosser examined the school's effectiveness in preparing boys for entry level leadership positions in productive industrial fields. Recommendations were then made as to how the school program could be modified to fulfill the Committee's purpose.

Prosser's suggestions as to how the school could meet its intended goal were similar to recommendations concerning vocational education made to the NSPIE. They included the elimination of foreign language studies, thus once again reiterating his belief that these studies were only of value for the college-bound student. English, mathematics and science were to be maintained in the curriculum but only as they related to business and industry. Instructors of these courses were to have business backgrounds for only with such a background could they truly know what to teach.

One of the subjects to be added would be a unit on citizenship. In referring to this topic, Prosser wrote:

> As a future worker in industry and a citizen, the pupil should understand his social and civic rights and responsibilities and should know and have an intelligent interest in the way the city, state, and nation carry on the business of government.[50]

This statement is a revealing one for in it Prosser provided his purpose of education. It is the same purpose

as he offered to the Indiana State Teachers Association, and it is the same one that he would maintain throughout his life.

The same year that he completed his doctoral work, Dr. Prosser was offered the position of director of the William Hood Dunwoody Industrial Institute in Minneapolis. According to John Crosby, one of the original members of the Board of Trustees, Charles Prosser was the board's first choice for Director. Prosser had been considering an offer as president of the University of Washington but chose the Dunwoody position when assured that the school shared his pro-organized labor stance. Another factor that influenced his decision was that since Dunwoody was a privately endowed school concerns over adequate funding from State legislatures would never arise.[51] Perhaps too, Prosser may have considered his lengthy struggle with local, state and federal governments in implementing `real' vocational education programs and realized that at Dunwoody his ideas could be easily implemented. Whatever his reasons, Prosser accepted the directorship at Dunwoody Industrial Institute, a school still in operation to this day.

Established in 1914, the Institute was named after its founder, William Hood Dunwoody. The 1915-1916 school prospectus, indicated that Mr. Dunwoody established the school because although many institutions offered liberal

education to youths of Minnesota, few provided instruction in industrial and mechanical arts. William Dunwoody left the management of the Institute under the control of a board of trustees who further defined school guidelines.

The trustees established that both men and women, past the age of fourteen, were eligible for admission. Several curricula were offered: a two year, full-time program to provide students with a foundation of industrial training as well as in general education; part-time instruction for those wage-earning youths requiring further training related to their chosen trade; evening classes for workers over age seventeen needing further instruction to assist them in their current job or prepare them for leadership positions.[52]

The course of study implemented at the Dunwoody Institute emerged from a needs-assessment survey of local industries and trades, completed by Dr. Prosser. The survey, made at the behest of the Minneapolis school board and Minneapolis Civic and Commerce Association, sufficiently impressed the Dunwoody Trustees. William Bovey, President of the Board, stated that Prosser "was given a free hand in the operation of the school and after the years have passed we are glad to say that we are satisfied that this confidence was not misplaced."[53]

In an unpublished memo to the Board of Trustees, dated April 13, 1945, Prosser reviewed his achievements made at

Dunwoody as director, along with contributing factors for these accomplishments. From 1914 to 1945 the school's enrollment and multiplicity of programs expanded. Beginning initially with 125 students and four full-time departments, enrollment grew to an average of 4100 annually with fourteen full-time programs.

Prosser stated that Dunwoody gained a national reputation in vocational education as evidenced by visits by educators from across the globe and the increasing frequency of requests for information and advice. In addition the curriculum was changed as needed, to meet the current demands of the country. Prosser listed the varying course revisions as follows:

> 1. Training for World War I; 2. Training civilians after peace; 3. Training handicapped veterans of World War I; 4. Conversion training during the depression of the thirties; 5. Training for World War II; and 6. Training returning veterans of World War II.[54]

With Prosser given free reign to implement programs and revise curriculum as well as procedures, the successes he enumerated at Dunwoody must be attributed to his influence. Most certainly, the factors for success that he detailed were implementations of proposals that Prosser espoused in the past. Among these were that Prosser saw the purpose of education as training for life with subjects offered such as getting a job, keeping physically fit, economical buying and getting along with the boss.

Another influence upon Dunwoody's achievements was the adherence to principles of habit formation, rather than mental training. The habits being developed were in the following fields: skill acquisition and the thinking involved in using these skills; developing efficient work practices; and in attaining sensible social and economic viewpoints.[55] Critical to Prosser's ideas on secondary as well as vocational education, were his views on habit formation and development. This concept will be discussed in further detail in proceeding chapters.

Director of the Federal Board for Vocational Education

While at Dunwoody, Dr. Prosser requested and received several leaves of absence. Some of these were to conduct vocational education surveys such as in the Hawaiian and Philippine Islands.[56] Requests for his services were growing and so was his reputation as a statesman and leader in vocational education.

One of Prosser's leaves involved a request to serve as Director of the newly created Federal Board for Vocational Education which emerged as part of the recently passed *Smith-Hughes Act*. Once his name was submitted, he received unanimous approval from the Board. Reasons for his selection can be found in a telegram, composed by James P. Munroe, vice-chairman of the Board, sent to the Trustees of Dunwoody:

> Federal Board for Vocational Education unanimously urges release.....of Dr. Prosser for six months beginning August 15, to be director. His intimate knowledge of the Smith-Hughes Act, familiarity with State problems and officials, and success meeting war demands make him man most needed to assist the board in laying lasting foundation for the administration of its very important work. Dunwoody would render high service to entire country by granting this urgent request.[57]

By appealing to the patriotic nature of the trustees at Dunwoody, Prosser's leave was granted. His absence would extend to two years.

During his term in his new position, Prosser's accomplishments were many. Meetings were held with representatives from states to prepare local legislation and organizational plans for vocational education. Regional offices were established and plans were made for recruitment and training of staff members. Instructions were issued as to the procedures for reimbursement of funds for states as well as local municipalities. In addition, a publications division was established to expeditiously prepare and release information.[58] Prosser's six month leave from Dunwoody extended into two years, most probably to ensure the intent of the *Smith-Hughes Act*--his intent--be faithfully carried out.

Dr. Prosser's extreme disdain towards general education, continued during his term with the Federal Board. When a shortage of government office space, in

Washington, D.C., resulted in an offer to temporarily share offices with the Bureau of Education, Prosser replied:

> No, sir; we don't want to be tied up with the regular public school system in any way. We learned our lesson once, and we are not going to permit the traditionally minded superintendents and principals to do to vocational education what they did to the manual training movement. We intend to stay away from the Bureau of Education, keep our vocational education separate and independent, and thus avoid any ground for suspicion that vocational education will ever be dominated by general education.[59]

His refusal resulted in the immediate rental of offices in a building apart from the Bureau of Education.[60]

The unwillingness to have any connection with general education was not only Prosser's belief, but representative of most in vocational education. Over the years attempts were made to merge the Office of Education with that of Vocational Education but were met by successful resistance from the latter group. It was only until the Federal Board for Vocational Education was abolished by federal order in 1933, that Prosser, offered some attempt at conciliation.[61] His efforts proved futile.

Prosser's long-standing concern was that vocational education maintain distance from and thus avoid influence by those in general education. The reverse however, was not true, as demonstrated by his newest attempts to reform general education since 1902, when he addressed the Indiana State Teacher's Association.

Prosser and the Life Adjustment Movement

In 1929 Charles Prosser formally reentered the area of general education reform with his book *Have We Kept the Faith?*, written in collaboration with Charles R. Allen. In this volume, an emotional plea was made to return public education to its original purpose as established by the country's founding fathers: that of preserving and promoting democratic ideals. This appeal was not made to educators but to the general populace.

In a scathing indictment of public education, the authors maintained that the school system, particularly high schools, was not adequate and change was necessary. Schools were isolated from life and teaching useless facts such as those taught in ancient history courses. In contrast, Prosser saw the goal of an education as to provide students with the ability to earn a living and understand their responsibilities as citizens.[62]

According to Prosser, the only way to achieve this educational aim would be through the cooperation of the `thinking' citizen with the progressive educator. He defined this type of educator as:

> One who believes that this democracy should be conserved by constantly adapting the schools to changing conditions so that they will help everybody to meet the changing demands of efficient leadership.[63]

Standing in contrast was the conservative educator, described as one adhering to the status quo. Because the two were locked in battle, it became contingent upon the `thinking' citizen to make the final decision as to which educational theory would prevail: that of education for social usefulness or that of education for personal success and enjoyment.[64]

Prosser's newest foray at general education reform was similar to that of past attempts in general as well as vocational education. He attacked theories of faculty psychology and instead emphasized the natural way of learning: through application of knowledge. Reform entailed infusing the curriculum with large doses of practicality, civic responsibility and preparation for life. By appealing to the general public for reform, rather than to educators, Prosser again demonstrated his distrust of those involved in general education.

The authors of *Have We Kept the Faith?* did not detail the program needed to return the schools to the ideas of the nation's forefathers. This was to be accomplished in a second book, never written. Over the years, while continuing to work in vocational education at Dunwoody, Prosser also focused specifically on revising the curriculum in secondary schools.

On April 14, 1939, Charles A. Prosser was invited to deliver the Inglis Lecture at Harvard University. Entitled

Secondary Education and Life (originally, "The High School and Life"), Prosser answered the question, "What should the secondary school teach in order to prepare youth for the better performance of the job called life?"[65] He responded to criticisms that those in favor of change were vague in their suggestions, by detailing a life-education program inclusive for grades nine through twelve. In his lecture Prosser also delineated suggested courses for the new curriculum along with methods to analyze the usefulness of subjects to be taught (see Chapter IV for details of this plan).

Secondary Education and Life was significant in two regards. First, on a national scale, Prosser's plan for high schools was specified to *educators*. His address to the Indiana State Teacher's Association provided some of these thoughts but not to the same extent nor to such a broad and influential audience. Second, Prosser formally referred to the primary objective of the new high school curriculum "as the improvement in the adjustment of youth to life."[66] This idea evolved into the Life Adjustment Movement.

Concerns about the curriculum in the high schools were not just those of Prosser's. The Education Policies Commission issued a significant report in 1944 titled, *Education for All American Youth*. According to the Commission, schools were to provide an education for *all*

youth, regardless of their background. Education was to be broad based in order to:

> (1) equip him to enter an occupation suited to his abilities and offering reasonable opportunity for personal growth and social usefulness; (2) prepare him to assume the full responsibilities of American citizenship; (3) give him a fair chance to exercise his right to the pursuit of happiness; (4) stimulate intellectual curiosity, engender satisfaction in intellectual achievement, and cultivate an ability to think rationally; and (5) help him to develop an appreciation of the ethical values which should undergird all life in a democratic society.[67]

The ideas of this Commission easily coincided with those of Dr. Prosser's. It appeared that general educators were more responsive to his ideas and Prosser, too, more open to working with them. When the Office of Education organized conferences to be held the following year in Washington, Prosser would attend.

Tendering his resignation from Dunwoody effective May 15, 1945, did not preclude Dr. Prosser's continued involvement in the areas of vocational and secondary education. On May 31 and June 1, 1945, the U.S. Office of Education sponsored a conference to consider future needs regarding vocational education. During the meetings, concerns were raised as to the difficulties experienced by those in high schools in fulfilling the needs of the entire adolescent population. Prosser was then asked to present a summary of the proceedings.

In his synopsis, he noted that 20 percent of the adolescent population received college preparation training

and another 20 percent received vocational training. However, the remaining 60 percent of youth lacked a distinct life adjustment training program that would fulfill their particular needs. Prosser requested that the United States Office of Education sponsor a national conference or series of regional conferences to consider the problems faced within secondary education. He added that the participants be comprised of an equal representation from those in the fields of general as well as vocational education.[68]

Known as the `Prosser Resolution', his proposal was accepted unanimously by those attending the conference. As per his suggestion, a series of conferences were established, and at the New York meeting, Prosser offered his ideas regarding life-adjustment education.

Perhaps recalling past resistance from those in secondary education to his views, Prosser delineated "the moving causes for this pronounced change of opinion."[69] Numerous reasons were listed, all blaming the schools for student short-comings and various social ills: the need for social agencies such as the NYA and CCC to help unemployed youth; students apathetic to life and maladjusted; a growing class of illiterate refugees who add to the ills of society; a lack of funds for life adjustment training resulting in an increase in the high school drop-out rate; and an increase in delinquency that is concomitant to a

similar increase in truancy. Although Prosser made a devastating critique of the secondary schools, he added, in a somewhat conciliatory vein, that vocational education forces were also at fault.[70]

Charles Prosser died November 26, 1952, before he could see his ideas concerning life-adjustment come to fruition. He also died before the full torrent of criticisms about these plans erupted.

Conclusion

Early in his career as an educator Prosser exhibited a strong interest in establishing preparation for life training as a prime function of education. In the Life Adjustment Movement, Prosser's educational views had come full circle. He was able to return to his original plan, offered in 1902, to reform general education. Then, too, in life adjustment training Prosser was able to realize the convergence of his ideas regarding vocational education with those of general education. In the next chapter Prosser's philosophy of education is examined.

CHAPTER ONE NOTES

[1] John F. Ohles, ed., Bibliographical Dictionary of American Educators, vol. 2, (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1978): 1062.

[2] Charles Allen Prosser, "Answers to Questions Asked by Dr. M. E. Curti of Smith College," [ca. 1933], Typewritten Document, Special Collection, Dunwoody Industrial Institute, Minneapolis, 1.

[3] Educator Journal, 3 (December 1902): 169.

[4] William L. Prosser, Letter to John Gadell, May 3, 1967, quoted in John Gadell, "Charles Allen Prosser: His Work in Vocational and General Education" (Ph.D. diss., Washington University, 1972), 16.

[5] Memoirs of the Lower Ohio Valley, vol. 1, (Madison,: Federal Publishing Co., 1905): 239.

[6] Educator Journal (December 1902): 169.

[7] Memoirs of the Lower Ohio Valley, 240.

[8] Ibid.

[9] Interview of William L. Prosser, in Gadell, 19-20.

[10] Ohles, 1062.

[11] Interview of William L. Prosser, in Gadell, 19-20.

[12] Educator Journal, 170.

[13] Interview of William L. Prosser, in Gadell, 25-26.

[14] Ibid., 26.

[15] Memoirs of the Lower Ohio Valley, 240.

[16] Charles Allen Prosser, "Needed Re-Adjustment of Our School System," Educator Journal 3 (February 1903): 236-49.

[17] Ibid., 241.

[18] Ibid., 242.

[19] Ibid., 249. Vocational education is a term that would have widespread use in the convening years; it would replace the term industrial education, the scope of which was deemed too limiting. In this study, for purposes of clarity, vocational and industrial education will be used interchangeably.

[20] Ohles, 1063.

[21] H. A. Buerk, "The Indiana Career," in "Charles Allen Prosser: A Testimonial in Recognition of His Service to Vocational Education," by M. Reed Bass, Chairman, [December] 1933, Typewritten Document, John A. Butler Learning Center, Dunwoody Industrial Institute, Minneapolis, pages unnumbered.

[22] Layton S. Hawkins, Charles A. Prosser and John C. Wright, Development of Vocational Education (Chicago: American Technical Society, 1951), 148.

[23] Buerk, pages unnumbered.

[24] George B. Lockwood, The New Harmony Movement, with the collaboration of Charles A. Prosser in the preparation of the educational chapters (New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1905).

[25] Buerk, pages unnumbered.

[26] See "New Albany School Board Minutes", 17 August 1908, Document, Stuart Barth Wrege Indiana History Collection, New Albany-Floyd County Public Library, New Albany, Ind.; and William T. Bawden, "Leaders in Industrial Education," Industrial Arts and Vocational Education 41 (September 1952): 219.

[27] William T. Bawden, "Leaders in Industrial Education," Industrial Arts and Vocational Education 41 (October 1952): 261.

[28] Academic record of Charles Allen Prosser at Columbia University, in Gadell, 135.

[29] Yale Faculty Committee, "Original Papers in Relation to a Course of Liberal Education," American Journal of Science and Art 15 (January 1829): 300-01, 346.

[30] Report of the Committee on Secondary School Studies, by Charles W. Eliot, Chairman (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1893), 44-48.

[31] Edward L. Thorndike and Robert S. Woodworth, "The Influence of Improvement of One Mental Function upon the Efficiency of Other Functions," Psychological Review 8 (May 1901): 247-56. See Chapter II for a discussion of Thorndike's research in this area.

[32] Prosser, "Answers to Curti," 2.

[33] Walter H. Drost, David Snedden and Education for Social Efficiency (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1967), 43-45; See Chapter II for an overview of Snedden's philosophy of Social Efficiency.

[34] David S. Snedden, "The Massachusetts Contribution," in "Charles Allen Prosser: A Testimonial in Recognition of His Service to Vocational Education," by M. Reed Bass, Chairman, [December] 1933, Typewritten Document, John A. Butler Learning Center, Dunwoody Industrial Institute, pages unnumbered.

[35] Report of The Commission on Industrial and Technical Education, by Carroll D. Wright, Chairman (New York: Columbia University Teachers College, 1906), 1-2.

[36] Ibid, 21.

[37] Charles Allen Prosser, "The Training of the Factory Worker." in The National Society for the Promotion of Industrial Education: Proceedings of the Fifth Annual Meeting Held in Cincinnati, Ohio, November 2-4, 1911, Bulletin No. 15, (New York: The Society, 1912), 148.

[38] Snedden, "The Massachusetts Contribution," pages unnumbered.

[39] William T. Bawden, "Leaders in Industrial Education," 41 (October 1952): 259.

[40] Hawkins, Prosser, and Wright, 148-49.

[41] The National Society for the Promotion of Industrial Education, Bulletin No. 15, 11-13.

[42] Ibid., 126-32.

[43] Charles Alpheus Bennett, History of Manual and Industrial Education 1870-1917 (Peoria, Ill.: Chas. A. Bennett Co., 1937), 544-546.

[44] See Charles Allen Prosser, "Annual Report of the Secretary for the Period from April 1st, 1912," in The National Society for the Promotion of Industrial Education:

Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Meeting Held in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, December 5-7, 1912, Bulletin No. 16, (Peoria, Ill.: Manual Arts Press, 1913), 299; and "Principles and Policies that Should Underlie State Legislation for a State System of Vocational Education," Bulletin No. 16, 292-297.

[45] John A. Lapp, "The National Commission," in "Charles Allen Prosser: A Testimonial in Recognition of His Service to Vocational Education," by M. Reed Bass, Chairman, [December] 1933, Typewritten Document, John A. Butler Learning Center, Dunwoody Industrial Institute, pages unnumbered.

[46] Report of the Commission on National Aid to Vocational Education, Vol. 1, by Hoke Smith, Chairman (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1914), 9.

[47] Ibid., 14-15.

[48] Lapp, pages unnumbered.

[49] Charles Allen Prosser, A Study of the Boston Mechanic Arts High School (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1915).

[50] Ibid., 29.

[51] John Crosby, "Board of Trustees Pays Tribute to Memory of Dr. Prosser; Outlines Accomplishments," Dunwoody News, 23 January 1953, p. 2.

[52] William Hood Dunwoody Industrial Institute, "Prospectus: 1915-1916", Typewritten Manuscript, John A. Butler Learning Center, Dunwoody Industrial Institute, Minneapolis, 9.

[53] William H. Bovey, "Director of the William Hood Dunwoody Industrial Institute," in "Charles Allen Prosser: A Testimonial in Recognition of His Service to Vocational Education," by M. Reed Bass, Chairman, [December] 1933, Typewritten Document, John A. Butler Learning Center, Dunwoody Industrial Institute, Minneapolis, pages unnumbered.

[54] Charles Allen Prosser, "Dunwoody's Past Present and Future", 13 April 1945, Typewritten Document, Special Collection, Dunwoody Industrial Institute, Minneapolis, 10.

[55] Ibid., 12-16.

[56] Bovey, pages unnumbered.

[57] James P. Munroe, Telegram to Dunwoody Industrial Institute, 09 August 1917, cited in John C. Wright, "Director of Federal Board," in "Charles Allen Prosser: A Testimonial in Recognition of His Service to Vocational Education," By M. Reed Bass, Chairman, [December] 1933, Typewritten Document, John A. Butler Learning Center, Dunwoody Industrial Institute, pages unnumbered.

[58] Hawkins, Prosser and Wright, 141-48, 165-72.

[59] Charles Allen Prosser, Conversation with Bawden, 1917, in William T. Bawden, "Leaders in Industrial Education," Industrial Arts and Vocational Education 42 (January 1953): 11.

[60] Bawden, "Leaders in Industrial Education," (January 1953), 11.

[61] Hawkins, Prosser, and Wright, 157-61.

[62] Charles Allen Prosser and Charles R. Allen, Have We Kept the Faith?: America at the Cross-Roads in Education (New York: Century Co., 1929), vii-xii.

[63] Ibid., 171.

[64] Ibid., 291.

[65] See Charles Allen Prosser, Secondary Education and Life (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1939), 1; and Charles Allen Prosser, "The High School and Life", 14 April 1939, Typewritten Document, Special Collection, Dunwoody Industrial Institute, Minneapolis.

[66] Ibid., 49.

[67] Education Policies Commission, Education for All American Youth, (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association and American Association of School Administrators, 1944), 21.

[68] See United States Office of Education, Life Adjustment Education for Every Youth, (Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, [1948]) 15; and Charles Allen Prosser, "The Adjustment of Youth to Life," Statement given at a conference held under the auspices of the U.S. Office of Education, New York, 11-12 April 1946, Typewritten Document, Special Collection, Dunwoody Industrial Institute, Minneapolis, 9. The actual wording of the "Prosser Resolution" can be found in Chapter IV.

[69] Prosser, "The Adjustment of Youth to Life," 1.

[70] Ibid., 1-3.

CHAPTER II

PHILOSOPHY OF SECONDARY EDUCATION

Charles Prosser's educational philosophy emerged as the result of a working class upbringing and his educational endeavors. Not only did he become receptive to the ideas advanced by David Snedden and educational psychologists such as Edward Thorndike, but he also advocated educational egalitarianism in relationship to the democratic ideals of America's founding fathers. John Dewey's views concerning the relationship of the school to society led the way for Prosser's conceptualization of practical education. The 1918 *Report of the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education* became significant to Prosser as it confirmed the educational tenets he maintained. Ideas concerning the specific nature of learning, curriculum, and instruction resulted from Prosser's philosophy of education.

Democratic Ideals of America's Early Leaders

Central to Prosser's ideas regarding secondary education was his concept of a democratic society and how this applied to principles of education. He attributed the development of these ideas to his specialization in social studies while a college student.[1] An additional influence may have been his study of law which inevitably included an

historical analysis of the democratic process. His master's thesis on the juvenile court movement most probably involved similar studies.

Prosser's interpretation of democracy in education was derived, in part, from the view that America's founding fathers conceived of a specific definition of democracy based on stipulations within the Declaration of Independence. The provisos of equality of opportunity under the law and all men as created equal and accorded certain unalienable rights, implied that all citizens be provided with equal opportunities to receive benefit from and provide benefit to society. The social and political philosophy that Prosser ascertained from these principles was:

> Man--every man and not a special class of men alone--is a social being capable of indefinite improvement as a man and as a citizen. The true purpose of all institutions, including governments, is to promote the happiness and well being of man, of all men and not a minority or even a majority of superior men. The office of the state, therefore, is to aid man--every man and not a favored group alone--in making the greatest possible improvement. Among all means of progress among men, education occupies the first place. The ideal civilization is one whose people are able to control most efficiently their own improvement and who are, therefore, constantly growing more effective in their realization of human happiness. The democratic state is the social organization in which the greatest possible progress (improvement) among men and their institutions will be secured.[2]

For Prosser, the democratic ideal of America's early leaders was a reliance on all citizens, to the best of

their abilities, to contribute to the welfare of the nation. He interpreted this as meaning the advancement of widespread intellectual development for all citizens. Thus, education was to benefit the masses rather than the aristocratic few.

Prosser found affirmation of this in the educational ideas of nine prominent men of the early Republic: publicists DuPont de Nemours, Robert Coram, Samuel Smith, and Noah Webster; James Sullivan and Nathaniel Chipman who were involved in law; and educators Lafitte du Corteil, Benjamin Rush, and Samuel Knox.[3] Prosser perceived in their independent thoughts a unanimity of opinion that America's educational system should provide real equality of opportunity by meeting the educational needs of all citizens. Since education was to equip the individual for social and political service, it should be sensitive to changing social and economic conditions. Education was to be unique to the country's specific needs and provide equality of opportunity to all citizens. Education was to be natural, and thus, imitate actual experiences as much as possible. Offering added weight to this educational argument, Prosser noted that various members of this group were closely allied with political leaders such as Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Jefferson, John Adams and James Madison.[4]

Each of the educational ideas expressed by these contemporaries of the nation's early leaders were

incorporated into Prosser's definition of secondary education. Substantiation of these views was also realized in the political and educational precepts of Thomas Jefferson, rather than those of Alexander Hamilton.

Hamilton, according to Prosser, believed that the general populace could not be trusted to govern themselves. Only a small group of citizens, usually emerging from the upper classes of society, were capable of intelligent decision making. As a consequence, political power must be delegated to this superior group.

Thomas Jefferson's faith in the common man stood in opposition to these ideas. Jefferson believed that all citizens, not just those within a select group, were capable of making wise decisions in designating leaders and determining governmental policies. To ensure that people of ability determined the affairs of the nation, all men were to be provided with opportunities to develop their citizenship skills.

Prosser maintained that the country had inappropriately selected Hamilton's aristocratic educational system. Educational ideals more closely aligned with nation's democratic philosophy were those of Jefferson. Prosser viewed his educational plan as eclectic and one not governed by the university. The goal was to train all citizens to their maximum ability to meet their own needs as well as those of the country.[5]

From the democratic ideals of America's early leaders, Prosser concluded education should benefit all students and not just favor only those preparing for college. The purpose of education was preparation for life which included training in citizenship. Learning was based on concrete activities.

John Dewey's Influence

Prosser regarded John Dewey as "perhaps America's greatest mind. . . ."[6] Although he never studied directly under Dewey while a student at Columbia University, it is doubtless that Prosser was exposed, in detail, to Dewey's philosophy of education.[7] Because Dewey's ideas concerning education were typically broadly conceived in depth and scope, they were open to diverse interpretations by many educators--among them Charles Prosser. Deweyan ideas most frequently mentioned by Prosser were those that concerned the integration of learning with life and practical education.

Important to Prosser's philosophy of education were Dewey's ideas stated in *The School and Society*, passages of which Prosser liberally quoted. Dewey maintained that human life was wasted in education as a result of "inadequate and perverted preparation."[8] The reason for this waste was isolation of the various units within the school system and a lack of unity as to the educational ideals within the schools. Prosser expressed similar views

in his 1902 address titled, *Needed Re-Adjustment of Our School System*. The difference in their viewpoints was that Prosser blamed the organizational problems of the school system upon the domination of the university, whereas Dewey merely noted that the structure had developed from the top down.[9]

Unity within the schools could only be achieved, argued Dewey, through connecting the school system to social life. He stated:

> From the standpoint of the child, the great waste in the school comes from his inability to utilize the experiences he gets outside the school in any complete and free way within the school itself; while, on the other hand, he is unable to apply in daily life what he is learning at school. That is the isolation of the school--its isolation from life.[10]

To leave no doubt as to what he meant, Dewey clarified the integral relationship needed between home, school, business-life, and community:

> The child can carry over what he learns in the home and utilize it in the school; and the things learned in the school he applies at home. These are the two great things in breaking down isolation, in getting connection--to have the child come to school with all the experience he has got outside the school, and to leave it with some thing to be immediately used in his everyday life.[11]

Of striking similarity to these thoughts were those expressed by Prosser. In his book, *Have We Kept the Faith?*, Prosser counseled:

> When the schools have been so integrated with life that learners can utilize in school the experiences they get outside of school and apply

> outside of school what they learn in it, the two could be kept integrated. An organic connection having once been established between organized education and this changing civilization, the two could act together. When life alters, so would the schools, This is the only means by which they can ever be adjusted and kept adjusted to the demands of living.[12]

Dewey, too, saw an organic connection between education and social life, however, he cautioned about its implications. In contrast to Prosser, Dewey did not see the school serving the function of job training, nor did he want special studies introduced into the curriculum. Instead, he requested:

> A natural connection of the everyday life of the child with the business environment about him, and that is the affair of the school to clarify and liberalize this connection, to bring it to consciousness, not by introducing special studies, like commercial geography and arithmetic, but by keeping alive the ordinary bonds of relation.[13]

In opposition stood Prosser who viewed vocational training as a vital function of the schools with special studies to be introduced during the last two years of high school.[14]

Both Prosser and Dewey perceived education to be of social service. While Dewey conceived of it in terms of social reform, Prosser believed that society was best served by offering that for which it asked. Despite these basic differences, Prosser continued to see himself aligned with Dewey's educational philosophy.

Dewey viewed democracy and education as inextricably entwined. As society was comprised of diverse groups,

democracy would be achieved in relation to the discovery of numerous and varied shared interest referents. These commonalities would serve as equalization factors to limit racial and class distinctions. Dewey regarded education as vital to this achievement:

> A society which is mobile, which is full of channels for the distribution of a change occurring anywhere, must see to it that its members are educated to personal initiative and adaptability. Otherwise, they will be overwhelmed by the changes in which they are caught and whose significance or connections they do not perceive.[15]

Prosser, too, perceived education as a tool for equalizing society, but not quite in the same way. All individuals were similar in their need of training for the preparation for life, which Prosser interpreted as the need for vocational education. Education would thus become democratized in recognition of differences between individuals and the provision of appropriate training in relation to this idea. Prosser explained:

> In any democracy, stability and progress depend upon the intelligence, not of the few, but of all the people. That intelligence can be developed fully only by a system of education which serves the interests, the needs, and the aptitudes of everybody.[16]

Through vocational education, Prosser believed, not only would the individual benefit but so too would society.

Both Dewey and Prosser viewed education of benefit to the individual and society. Their ideas diverged in regard to the method and extent these gains were realized. Dewey

defined education in terms of individual growth which ultimately provided for direction of future experiences. New and better habits were learned that eased adjustment to the environment and yet, primarily, preserved command over it. Dewey maintained, progressive societies

> endeavor to shape the experiences of the young so that instead of reproducing current habits, better habits shall be formed, and thus the future adult society be an improvement on their own.[17]

While Prosser viewed education as a service to society he did not see it as a tool for changing society. Repeatedly he avowed that schools were to instill correct habits of thinking and doing. Appropriate habits to be learned within vocational education were those in current and popular use in the work-place. Concerning the general education curriculum, he suggested that subjects be chosen on their utility in aiding the individual to deal with future problems of life.

A major difference between Prosser and Dewey were their views regarding the purpose of vocational studies and the separation of vocational and liberal education. Dewey was not adverse to the inclusion of occupations into the classroom, but their function was not to be narrowly utilitarian as was the case in training geared primarily for employment. Vocations, instead, were to be used as learning tools for providing an awareness of man's historical development.[18] In contrast, Prosser viewed

vocational education as "training whose dominant aim is to help trainees meet the specific demands of an occupation."[19]

In Dewey's ideas, primarily those addressed in *The School and Society*, Prosser saw the educational need to integrate learning with life and utilize concrete learning activities. By virtue of the similarity of statements made by the two men it is likely that Prosser's own judgments concerning the value of vocational training emerged as a result of his interpretation of Dewey's thoughts.

Scientific Principles of Learning

Throughout his career in education Prosser emphasized the importance of task-specific training. He contended that modern science had refuted the age-worn notion that the mind consisted of general powers or faculties which, once strengthened or trained, would facilitate learning in all associated areas. To learn instead, were habits which had direct application to each educational objective. Influential to the development of this aspect of Prosser's educational theory was Edward Thorndike whom he studied under at Columbia, and subsequently referred to as "probably the outstanding experimental psychologist of the world in the field of education."[20] It was Thorndike's research, and later that of educational psychologists Daniel Starch and Arthur Gates, that Prosser repeatedly offered as support for theories of habit training.

Edward Thorndike's experimental investigations concerning transfer of training and mental discipline conducted during the early twentieth century were significant in dispelling the idea that education consisted of strengthening or developing individual powers of the mind.[21]

Thorndike collaborated with Robert S. Woodworth, in 1901, in a series of articles all entitled, "The Influence of One Mental Function upon the Efficiency of Other Functions."[22] The research consisted of experiments to measure the influence of training in one area upon changes in a separate, untrained area. Thorndike concluded:

> Improvement in any single mental function need not improve the ability in functions commonly called by the same name. It may injure it.
>
> Improvement in any single mental function rarely brings about equal improvement in any other function, no matter how similar, for the working of every mental function-group is conditioned by the nature of the data in each particular case.[23]

Thorndike, therefore, offered evidence as to the limitations in application of knowledge gained in one situation to other situations. Referred to as transfer of training, he deduced that the degree of transfer between functions was proportional to the number of shared identical elements.

Never claiming to dispel the theory of mental discipline, Thorndike doubted its value when viewed as justification for the inclusion of traditional subjects in

the high school curriculum. Instead, he viewed practical subjects which closely resembled activities in life, as increasing the likelihood of transfer of learning. In 1906, he wrote that abundant evidence existed against the assertion that training in languages and mathematics afforded improvement in intellectual processes as a whole. He added:

> Right methods of thinking can be inculcated as well in forestry, electrical engineering, nursing or the sciences concerned with agriculture, and the chances of transfer of these methods to the general activities of life is greatest where the subject is most like, not most abstracted from the general activities of life.[24]

Thorndike's research substantiated Prosser's belief in the inefficacy of teaching traditional, scholastic subjects and the restrictions of transfer of learning. Prosser rejected the ideas:

> 1. That the mind is a collection of mystic faculties and powers[.]
>
> 2. That by certain superior disciplinary studies these faculties and powers can be developed as "mental muscles" which once developed can be used efficiently to meet every situation in life.[25]

Rather, Prosser perceived the mind as a "neural switchboard," similar to a telephone switchboard, where habits were learned through repeated practice.[26]

In *Secondary Education and Life*, Prosser reported that Daniel Starch and Arthur Gates corroborated and expanded upon Thorndike's views. Starch delineated the limitations of transference and determined it secondary in importance

to a subject's content value when determining the selection of school studies.[27] Gates suggested that since transfer of training was greatest between school subjects most similar to life's events, preferred were "genuine life issues and widely usable facts rather than unreal and fantastic problems, or trivial, unusual, or academic facts."[28]

Based on these principles Prosser unwaveringly insisted that specific subjects were superior to general or disciplinary subjects because of their superior utilitarian, transfer, and teaching values.[29] Since learning was task-specific, the training of correct habits was needed. Subjects taught were to be practical, and resemble real-life activities as much as possible.

Prosser was not alone in these views. Also giving credence to such beliefs were advocates of the doctrines of social efficiency.

Snedden and Social Efficiency

Prosser attributed his social convictions to David Snedden--his instructor, mentor and friend.[30] Dr. Snedden, a noted educational sociologist at Columbia University was influenced in the development of his educational philosophy by his graduate studies with Edward Ross and Frank Giddings. Ross provided Snedden with the idea of the school as a tool for social control. Through Giddings, Snedden gained an educational interpretation of Herbert

Spencer's ideas concerning natural selection. Selected Commissioner of Education of Massachusetts in 1909, Snedden promoted vocational education programs, first statewide and then nationally, through the *Smith-Hughes Act*, as a means of fulfilling his specific perceptions concerning educational purpose.[31]

Snedden's philosophy integrated utilitarian democratic ideals with scientific methodologies which resulted in the interpretation of education for social usefulness. Although Snedden and Prosser shared many ideas concerning secondary education, subtle, yet significant differences in their ideas also existed.

Snedden's ideas emerged during a period of social confusion in America. The result of massive immigration to urban areas and rapid industrialization at the end of the nineteenth century led to concerns regarding the individualistic nature of society. Under attack were laissez-faire governmental policies regarding limited economic interference. Similarly criticized was the contention that the stability of society rested upon unrestricted evolution of natural laws.[32] As demands grew for social reform, the social efficiency philosophy emerged.

By design, social efficiency in education was to benefit society through preparing individuals to become more socially and vocationally useful according to

prescribed characteristics. Individuals were to be given instruction in those attitudes and skills necessary to achieve predetermined goals.[33] Who was to choose these goals became the crux of the schism that developed within the social efficiency movement.

According to Edward Krug in *The Shaping of the American High School*, two models of social efficiency emerged.[34] Social efficiency for social service viewed the school as an agency to effect reform through educating individuals to meet their own personal needs in relation to the broad needs of society. In this model, the school was to serve as a guiding force that would lead the individual to self-direction towards personal and social benefit. In contrast stood the paradigm of social efficiency which added the aspect of social control. The school was to act as an agent to adapt the individual to society by preparation into their presumed future societal roles. Based on scientific knowledge, the schools were to determine the probable destiny of the individual. It was to this plan of social efficiency that David Snedden prescribed.

Influenced by Herbert Spencer, Snedden viewed society as governed by laws of evolution. An appropriate education was needed for those in society not destined to be leaders --a group he referred to as the `rank and file'. The universities were to continue to prepare those bound for

positions of leadership but, for the large majority of the population, utilitarian training was recommended to assure individual, as well as societal efficiency. To meet this end, public education was charged with the responsibility of trade and business training in addition to training for culture.[35]

Prosser agreed with Snedden that vocational training must be incorporated into the secondary school curriculum to afford equal opportunities to all. The curriculum plan that Prosser developed for secondary education, as outlined in *Secondary Education and Life*, delineated provisions for the college-bound student.[36] Prosser did not, however, adhere to the application of evolutionary laws to society. In rejecting this popular idea he said:

> Darwin's law may be Jehovah's method of originating plant and animal types. It has no place in a civilization that has built churches and schools, libraries and hospitals, asylums and sanitariums with which to combat in the name of humanity the cruel operation of natural law. The law of the survival of the fittest has no place in the educational system of a Republic which must be saved from the dangers which beset it by a more intelligent citizenship.[37]

Instead, Prosser believed that students' interests, abilities, and desires were to guide their educational choice.

The new educational plan proposed by Snedden was based on scientific knowledge and adherence to democratic ideals, an idea with which Prosser concurred. Snedden stated:

> The new education will obviously have to possess far wider and more purposeful aims; its range of adaptability will, of necessity, be immeasurably greater; its methods must rest on a scientific basis; and its organization must become complex and flexible in order to produce an efficient combination of democratic control and technical direction.[38]

For Snedden, utilization of the aforementioned educational model would promote human welfare through social economy which he defined as those agencies providing culture, community ideals, and economic efficiency. Social control was to be exerted upon the individual through education which was deliberate in its control of the habits to be formed, ideals to be developed, and knowledge conferred. Although other agencies existed that were concerned with education such as church, home, and work, their responsibilities in these functions had diminished. It was the role of the school, as an institution under public control, to assume neglected societal obligations.[39]

The types of programs Snedden foresaw as providing a path to conformance with democratic ideals, was through a differentiated course of study in the schools. Individuals varied according to their native abilities and interests. So too, said Snedden, must educational programs:

> An educational system, suited to the needs of democracy, must be indefinitely flexible in order that each may have before him the educational opportunities which shall enable him best to serve society and himself.[40]

He concluded that forced classification and assignment of studies was a necessity, but only insofar as directed by

students' abilities. In response to critics who claimed that only through a uniform educational program would democratic ideals be realized and class distinctions diminished, Snedden stated the opposite to be true. Uniform studies met the needs of only one class of individual--the student preparing for college, whereas a flexible educational system met the needs of everyone.

While Prosser agreed that vocational education would provide social efficiency in relation to its ability to instill correct habits, Prosser was referring to those that specifically related to vocational training--not socio-ideological control, alluded to strongly by Snedden. Prosser believed that the purpose of an education was to aid individuals in their adjustment to society. It was not to reform society nor to control it. An education was to provide experiences which would, as a result

> affect the habits, the thinking, and the decisions of human beings so that they are able to adapt themselves to their social environment and meet its demands with at least some measure of success.[41]

For Prosser education was more of a service to society than that of acting as a governing agent. Prosser asserted:

> It is to be the mission of the schools in the future to select and to adjust boys and girls for life by having them undergo varied experiences in order to uncover their varied tastes and aptitudes and to direct and to train them in the avenues for which they display the most capacity.[42]

Students were adjusted or readied for life's contingencies rather than dictatorially molded to preconceived notions of their future life. Nonetheless, students were only guided toward vocational areas for which there was employment.[43]

Differences also existed between Snedden and Prosser regarding the student's selection of an appropriate curriculum. Snedden advised that educators were to determine by measurement the student's innate abilities and interests, ascertain the family's ability to finance a college education, and take into account the student's probable educational destination based on individual differences in cultural and social needs. Differentiation of studies was to begin as early as the sixth grade.[44] Though Prosser was a loyal advocate of differentiated high school studies, he did not deem it within the school's authority to dictate the future of the student. According to Prosser, vocational training was implemented only when the student decided to end liberal studies. In addition, he believed such training "be built upon the largest foundation of general education which the youth is willing and able to lay before he undertakes training for an occupation or a pursuit."[45]

Snedden viewed secondary education as consisting of liberal and vocational education components with social control an important factor in each. Individuals maintained a dual relationship to society as both producers and

consumers of utilities. As producers, books were written and houses built but as consumers, books provide inspiration and houses offered shelter. Snedden explained:

> What we call the social inheritance--knowledge, ideals, institutions, inventions, all capitalized in more or less permanent forms--is at the disposal of any qualified user. In a world of specialized producers, each person sufficiently trained in utilization has for his enjoyment and service endless stores of science, of art, of religious ideals, of political capacity, and of economic resources.[46]

Prosser also believed a dual relationship existed in education. General education was to prepare individuals to become intelligent consumers of goods while competent producers would result from vocational training. He contended:

> Progress in human intelligence and refinement comes just in proportion as general and vocational training advance together. The first gives better taste, better standards, higher ideals of selection and use of products. The second gives larger skill, higher intelligence, greater efficiency in the making of things to minister to rising standards of taste.[47]

For Snedden, liberal education was purposive with application to the individual's life and to society. Educational goals of mental training and training for culture were to be replaced by the goal of proven usefulness. Necessarily excluded were rote drills in studies such as algebra, Latin, and ancient history. Instead, a curriculum was to be developed that emphasized students' appreciation of their environment.[48]

In clear agreement with these ideas was Prosser. In speaking of the ideal curriculum he maintained:

> All outworn subjects, all obsolete knowledge, and all nonfunctioning facts and ideas will be discarded. Usable knowledge will be taught in connection with thinking about matters related to the real demands of life and in connection with the living of life both inside and outside the school.[49]

Therefore, traditional, disciplinary studies were ineffectual and useless to the student and were not to be part of high school studies. Another area of consensus between Snedden and Prosser was in the delineation of the vocational education program.

Vocational education, according to Snedden, was a function of the school as home, workshop, and farm declined in their effectiveness in this area of training. The goal of vocational education was economic efficiency as measured by the degree to which training met the efficiency standards within the workplace. This could only be achieved by adherence to certain basic principles. Since vocational education maintained different goals and methods than those of general education, the two were to be kept separate. Program administration would be distinct from general education. Whereas specific habits of skill and attention were educational objectives, teachers of main subjects would be skilled workers themselves, with the school program to duplicate the working environment as much as possible.[50]

Prosser championed ideas identical to these throughout his career. Vocational training was to: promote specific habits related to the task to be learned; duplicate the actual working environment whenever possible; only employ instructors having had successful field experiences in the areas they would be teaching; train students to meet market demands rather than train for idealized conditions. In order to accomplish this, Prosser zealously supported the idea of separatism between vocational and general education in concern to administration, and teaching staffs. He claimed that the utilitarian basis of vocational training would be tainted by intermingling with the traditional beliefs held by liberal educators.[51]

Overall, Snedden played an important role in the development of Charles Prosser's educational philosophy, particularly in respect to vocational education and its relationship to general education. The differences in their ideas existed more in stages of interpretation than in basic theory. Also to help define Prosser's philosophical frame of reference were the ideas expressed in the report issued by the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education.

Impact of Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education

The Commission's report, *Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education*, reflected a growing interest in vocational and practical education as playing an integral

role in the high school curriculum. As chairman of the Commission, Clarence Kingsley summarized the views of a twenty six member reviewing committee and issued the report, in final form, in 1918. Prosser used the report as justification for embracing the principles behind life adjustment education even though critical of the Commission's position concerning the educational aim of worthy use of leisure time.

In the report, extensive modifications of secondary education were requested due to societal changes, the advent of educational psychology, an awareness of the developmental nature of learning, and the need for education to fulfill its democratic function. The purpose of a democracy, according to the Commission, was to organize society so that individuals fully developed their interests in relation to the interests of society as a whole. Each student was to aspire to reach a high degree of vocational and social efficiency. Thus, the goal of formal and informal education was to "develop in each individual the knowledge, interests, ideals, habits, and powers whereby he will find his place and use that place to shape both himself and society toward ever nobler ends."[52]

To meet the prescribed educational goal, seven main objectives were developed based on life's duties: "1. Health. 2. Command of fundamental processes. 3. Worthy home-membership. 4. Vocation. 5. Citizenship. 6. Worthy

use of leisure. 7. Ethical character."[53] Achievement of any objective was believed to render individual as well as group benefit. In addition, all educational aims were interrelated, particularly those concerning vocational aspects of life.

The careful selection of vocational studies was to provide family sustenance, personal fulfillment and social benefit and was, therefore, related to fulfilling the educational goals of worthy home membership and citizenship. Vocational guidance was a critical aspect in choice of occupational area. To be considered were individual capabilities and needs, and the extent to which the secondary institution was able to provide adequate instruction in the desired vocational field.

The Commission viewed education as "preparation for life."[54] To meet this end, practical instruction was emphasized within each of the seven objectives. Knowledge was to have not only immediate relevance to students but stimulate interest in the acquisition of habits and ideas that would prove of value to them as adults. The Commission recommended that all subjects be structured as self-inclusive units rather than as part of a multi-year program. Education was to render benefit to everyone within society and to do so called for a new, differentiated high school program within a single, comprehensive school organization.

The Commission suggested that their goals could best be achieved by redefining school enrollment. Secondary education, for students of ages twelve to eighteen years, was to be evenly divided into junior and senior divisions. The junior division would serve as an exploratory period for the student to hone awareness of their interests and abilities, particularly in regard to future vocational choice. The senior period of high school would emphasize a specialized curriculum as determined by personal needs and those as a societal member. Although vocational preference would dictate special studies, unification of the student body would occur through mandated enrollment in core courses.[55]

When comparing the *Report of the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education* to Prosser's plan for high school studies, striking similarities are found. In both, educational purpose was delineated as equal opportunity for all students to meet individual needs as well as those needs relevant to society. The two also emphasized social efficiency as achieved through societal service rather than control. Similar to the Commission, Prosser developed a differentiated vocational curriculum, that also included central subjects related to life's responsibilities, through which the student received life preparation training. Utilitarian studies were also common to

either plan, as well as the inclusion of specialized studies during the latter years of high school.

A section of the Commission's report to which Prosser took strong exception was the educational objective of worthy use of leisure time. Prosser equated any reference to this educational aim as a reversion to the aristocratic origins of liberal education. He postulated:

> While seemingly no thinking American would dispute the general educator's adoption of education for the worthy use of leisure as one of the cardinal means to our American ideal of the fullest social participation by each individual, the fact remains that the concept of liberal education for leisure belongs to the oligarchic, or the so-called aristocratic, and not the democratic, tradition.[56]

Prosser maintained that social participation of all citizens was better achieved through vocational training because democratic principles demanded that all citizens share in the work of society. An occupation was to provide the nucleus through which individuals were inspired to partake in worthy activities of leisure.

Irrespective of his objections to this aspect of the Commission's report, Prosser used the seven cardinal principles as a defense for his model of secondary education as delineated in his 1939 lecture, *Secondary Education and Life.*[57] In all probability the report served as a guide in the development of his plan to synthesize general and vocational education.

A Philosophy Defined

Charles Prosser believed that society required an intelligent citizenship to meets its many demands. Every person within a society was of value, therefore, service to society was expected of each individual. A changing world demanded a society responsive to scientific methodologies in order to meet new demands. Society was measured by the efficient performance of its citizens as well as efficient service rendered by its agencies.[58] From these social convictions, Prosser developed a corresponding frame of reference regarding secondary education.

A main tenet of Prosser's educational philosophy was that all citizens of a democracy were due an education from which they could derive benefit. The prime purpose of an education was to profit society rather than the individual. This could only be achieved by preparing individuals for life's responsibilities. According to Prosser, "The only justification for public education is the need of preparation by its citizens to serve the democracy and not for their individual success or personal enjoyment."[59] Such an education would result in a trained citizenry as well as trained leaders.

Everyone was worthy of an education, of which the purpose was training in the performance of socially valuable tasks. Thus, a wide variety of educational

programs was mandatory due to the divergent abilities, interests, and needs of the population.

Prosser regarded education and society as inextricably related. Since the demands of life were subject to change, flexibility must be inherent within education. Thus, education was never to be dominated by traditional practices.[60] Only in adherence to these principles would all citizens find vocations that were not merely of individual benefit but of value to society.

Prosser remained firmly committed to this educational creed throughout his life and perceived vocational education as a means of satisfying these educational goals. Vocational training prepared the individual for the demands and needs of society and, thus, afforded social efficiency through conservation of natural and human resources. Prosser explained:

> It conserves material resources by promoting, disseminating and transmitting skill, knowledge and the results of invention, and by conserving human effort. It conserves human resources, not only by conserving human effort, but by promoting morale and intelligence.[61]

Vocational education--whether offered alone as in special schools or programs, or integrated into the general education curriculum as in life adjustment training--provided the avenue to meet the democratic ideals of widespread intelligence among the populace and social service.

A Theory Applied

The educational practices Prosser endorsed were consistent with his theories of secondary education. In addition, most of the theories he developed specific to vocational education were also applied to the general secondary curriculum.[62]

Achievement of Prosser's educational goals required that the high school maintain a differentiated curriculum and that vocational education become one of the dominant responsibilities of the public high school. The traditional, disciplinary curriculum was replaced by a utilitarian course of study based on individual's needs, abilities, and interests. For those few students preparing for college, a modified curriculum was offered blending traditional and functional subjects.

Prosser avowed that the early years of high school consist of practical life-studies in which students were given opportunities to ascertain their various aptitudes in relation to their interests and needs. The last two years of high school involved specific studies directly related to the student's future vocational choice or, as the case might be, preparation for college.

Certain basic features were common to all areas of study, according to Prosser. Modern science had dispelled outworn notions concerning the selection of subjects based

on their ability to train the mind. Thus, subjects were now selected contingent on their: value of usefulness in life; transfer value from school to life situations; and value as instruments to promote principles of sound instruction.[63] Only those subjects that had immediate practical application were offered. Mastery of any task necessitated the inculcation of correct habits of thought and performance. Prosser explained:

> All that youth carry from school to life are the potential mental reactions which they have developed there. Even facts and ideas are retained and utilized only when they have been tied into neural patterns by some use of them in thinking or doing, or both. Desirable habits in its youth are not only what the country greatly needs, but they are also the only assets the schools can develop which will carry over into improved living. Expression, participation, practice in doing things and thinking about things are the only ways by which they are ever developed--not by the absorption of mere factual learning, untried theories, or preachment!
>
> Like all other learning, habits are special and not general. Established in one field of learning they are usable only in that field and in related situations in other fields having identical elements.[64]

Accordingly, Prosser viewed general training which emphasized fundamental skills in the preparation for life, as a precursor to specific training.

Utilization of appropriate instructional methods and employment of appropriate personal, were important considerations to Prosser. His belief that vocational and traditional, general education programs be kept separate, resulted in his devotion to a dual administrative policy.

To ensure that principles of utility prevailed, Prosser insisted that practical instruction replace lecture and rote learning. Whenever possible, instructors were to be chosen on the basis of their successful employment experiences outside the classroom, rather than their pedagogical skills.

Conclusion

Charles Prosser's philosophy of secondary education was a synthesis of ideas formulated, primarily, during his early adult years. He was influenced by the egalitarian educational concepts of early American leaders and John Dewey's philosophy pertaining to the integration of school and society. The views of educational psychologists provided Prosser with ideas concerning task-specific instruction. Aspects of David Snedden's social and educational theories, regarding the school as an agency in attaining social efficiency, as well as his ideas involving vocational education, also added to Prosser's educational philosophy. The *Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education* afforded Prosser a model to support his ideas concerning the integration of vocational education into the general, secondary curriculum.

All of these factors served as a catalyst in forming Prosser's own ideas concerning education. Contrary to the beliefs of several researchers, Prosser's educational philosophy was not solely an interpretation of Snedden's

views nor did Prosser adhere to Snedden's ideas concerning social control.[65]

Prosser's educational philosophy was characterized by the belief that the purpose of an education was to provide benefit to society. Society was advantaged through a citizenry which was prepared for life's responsibilities. Preparation for life entailed practical, utilitarian training directly tied to the specific goal of attaining a vocation. Therefore, vocational training was the prime function of education. True to this philosophy, Prosser adopted methods and procedures which advanced his concept of vocational education. The ideas that Prosser formulated specific to vocational education at the secondary level are discussed in the next chapter.

CHAPTER TWO NOTES

[1] Charles Allen Prosser, "Answers to Questions Asked by Dr. M. E. Curti of Smith College," [ca. 1933], Typewritten Document, Special Collection, Dunwoody Industrial Institute, Minneapolis, 1.

[2] Charles Allen Prosser and Charles R. Allen, Have We Kept the Faith?: America at the Cross-Roads in Education (New York: Century Co., 1929), 6.

[3] Prosser and Allen, Have We Kept the Faith?, 10-11, citing Allen Oscar Hansen, Liberalism and American Education in the Eighteenth Century (New York: Macmillan, 1926).

[4] Ibid., 12-15, 11.

[5] Ibid., 121-25, 135-37.

[6] Charles Allen Prosser, "In the Camp of the Schoolmaster," Commencement address given at Fort Collins Summer School, Colorado State College, 15 August 1945, Typewritten Document, Special Collection, Dunwoody Industrial Institute, Minneapolis, 5.

[7] For a record of Prosser's courses while a student at Teachers College see, John Gadell, "Charles Allen Prosser: His Work in Vocational and General Education" (Ph.D. diss., Washington University, 1972), 132-35.

[8] John Dewey, The School and Society (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1899), 77.

[9] See Charles Allen Prosser, "Needed Re-Adjustment of Our School System," Educator Journal 3 (February 1903): 237; and Dewey, The School and Society, 81.

[10] Ibid., 89.

[11] Ibid., 97.

[12] Prosser and Allen, Have We Kept the Faith?, 429.

[13] Dewey, The School and Society, 91.

[14] Charles Allen Prosser, Secondary Education and Life (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1939), 64-65.

[15] John Dewey, Democracy and Education (New York: Macmillan, 1916; Free Press, 1966), 88.

[16] Prosser and Allen, Have We Kept the Faith?, vii.

[17] Dewey, Democracy and Education, 79.

[18] Dewey, The School and Society, 33. A further discussion of Dewey's views concerning the relationship of vocational and general education can be found in Chapter III.

[19] Prosser, Secondary Education and Life, 77.

[20] Charles Allen Prosser, "Vocational Education as Life Adjustment," Presentation given to the Wisconsin Educational Association, 1936 or 1937, Typewritten Document, Special Collection, Dunwoody Industrial Institute, Minneapolis, 11.

[21] Walter B. Kolesnik, Mental Discipline in Modern Education (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1958), 31-32.

[22] Edward L. Thorndike and Robert S. Woodworth, "The Influence of Improvement in One Mental Function upon the Efficiency of Other Functions," Psychological Review VIII (May 1901): 247-61, 384-95, 553-64.

[23] Ibid., 250.

[24] Edward L. Thorndike, "The Opportunity of the High Schools," The Bookman 24 (October 1906): 184.

[25] Charles Allen Prosser, "You and Your Mind," Speech given before the National Conference on Trade and Industry and Distributive Education, 14-25 August 1939, Typewritten Document, Special Collection, Dunwoody Industrial Institute, Minneapolis, 1.

[26] Prosser, "Vocational Education as Life Adjustment," 7.

[27] Daniel Starch, Educational Psychology (New York: Macmillan, 1923), 255.

[28] Arthur I. Gates, Psychology for Students of Education (New York: Macmillan, 1924), 371-72.

[29] Prosser, "You and Your Mind," 2.

[30] Prosser, "Answers to Curti," 2.

[31] Joseph F. Luetkemeyer, "The Snedden/Prosser Social Efficiency Paradigm of Vocational Education," Journal of Industrial Teacher Education 25 (Fall 1987):36-37.

[32] See Sidney Fine, Laissez Faire and the General-Welfare State (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1956), 373-74; and Luetkemeyer, 33-34.

[33] Walter H. Drost, David Snedden and Education for Social Efficiency (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1967), 3.

[34] Edward A. Krug, The Shaping of the American High School (New York: Harper and Row, 1964), 249-83.

[35] David S. Snedden, "The Schools of the Rank and File," Stanford Alumnus I (June 1900): 185-87.

[36] Prosser, Secondary Education and Life, 4.

[37] Prosser, "Needed Re-Adjustment of Our School System," 242.

[38] David S. Snedden, Problems of Educational Readjustment (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1913), 9.

[39] Ibid., 9-18.

[40] Ibid., 20-21.

[41] Charles Allen Prosser and Thomas H. Quigley, Vocational Education in a Democracy, rev. ed. (Chicago: American Technical Society, 1949), 1. The first edition of this book was published in 1925, by Charles Prosser and Charles Allen. Subsequent notes will refer to the edition from which the material was derived.

[42] Charles Allen Prosser, "Practical Arts and Vocational Guidance," Manual Training Magazine XIV (February 1913): 215.

[43] Prosser, "Answers to Curti," 6.

[44] David S. Snedden, "Differences among Varying Groups of Children Should Be Recognized; and the Period at which This Recognition Takes Place May Rationally Constitute the Beginnings of Secondary Education," in Journal of Proceedings and Addresses of the Forty-Sixth Annual Meeting

Held in Cleveland, Ohio, June 29-July 3, 1908, by the National Education Association, Winona, Minn.: National Education Association, 1908, 752-55.

[45] Charles Allen Prosser and Charles R. Allen, Vocational Education in a Democracy (New York: Century Co., 1925), 94. A revised edition of this book was published in 1949, by Charles Prosser and Thomas Quigley. Subsequent notes will refer to the edition from which the material is derived.

[46] Snedden, Problems of Educational Readjustment, 71.

[47] Charles Allen Prosser, "The Mission of Art Education in the Public Schools," School and Society 14 (17 September 1921): 169.

[48] Snedden, Problems of Educational Readjustment, 81-83.

[49] Prosser and Allen, Have We Kept the Faith?, 423.

[50] Snedden, Problems of Educational Readjustment, 183-92.

[51] Prosser and Allen, Vocational Education in a Democracy, (1925), 194-98, 200-04, 213-14.

[52] Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education: A Report of the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education, by Clarence D. Kingsley, Chairman (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1918), 9.

[53] Ibid., 9-16.

[54] Ibid., 16.

[55] Ibid., 17-26.

[56] Prosser and Quigley, Vocational Education in a Democracy (1949), 15.

[57] Prosser, Secondary Education and Life, 58-59.

[58] Prosser and Allen, Have We Kept the Faith?, 72-73.

[59] Prosser, "Answers to Curti," 2.

[60] Prosser and Allen, Have We Kept the Faith?, 154-56.

[61] Prosser and Allen, Vocational Education in a Democracy (1925), 19.

[62] Ibid., 194-209. See APPENDIX A for Prosser's sixteen theories of vocational education.

[63] Prosser and Allen, Secondary Education and Life, 1-7.

[64] Charles Allen Prosser, "The Adjustment of Youth to Life," Statement given at a conference held under the auspices of the U.S. Office of Education, New York, 11-12 April 1946, Typewritten Document, Special Collection, Dunwoody Industrial Institute, Minneapolis, 6.

[65] See Merle Eugene Curti, The Social Ideas of American Educators (New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1935), 560; John Gadell, "Charles Allen Prosser: His Work in Vocational and General Education" (Ph.D. diss., Washington University, 1972), 159; Arthur G. Wirth, "Issues Affecting Education and Work in the Eighties: Efficiency Versus Industrial Democracy, A Historical Perspective," Teachers College Record 79 (September 1977): 57-56; William G. Camp, "Social Efficiency Revisited: A Cornerstone of the Foundation," Journal of the American Association of Teacher Educators in Agriculture 23 (1982): 35-36; Camp, "Social Efficiency and Vocational Education: An Examination of Our Changing Philosophies," Journal of Vocational Education Research VIII (Summer 1983): 14; and Luetkemeyer, 37.

CHAPTER III

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IN RELATIONSHIP TO SECONDARY EDUCATION

Concerned that the secondary schools were elitist only meeting the needs of those who had the intellectual abilities and funds to attend college, Charles Prosser viewed vocational education as a means of democratizing the educational system. In the *Report of the Commission on National Aid to Vocational Education*, primarily authored by Prosser, vocational education was described as a practical form of education resulting in the preparation of a student for useful employment.[1] Through vocational education programs, all students would be prepared to meet the social and economic demands awaiting them as adults.

Prosser saw vocational education as a return to the intent of America's founding fathers, which he stated as:

> 1. There should be real equality of opportunity in education; 2. an American system of education should be adapted to American needs; 3. education should be for social and political service and not idle culture; 4. education should be natural and not artificial; 5. education should be of such a character as to make the youth efficient in lines of business; 6. a changing system of education is required to meet changing conditions and needs; 7. the program of a new democracy could only be carried out in practice through the aid of education for everybody.[2]

Vocational education would fulfill the ideas of these early leaders by providing equal educational opportunities for

all through a pragmatic course of study. An eclectic educational process, responsive to society's needs, would be established. Instruction was to be experiential and concrete rather than by lecture and rote learning. Social and economic benefits would be realized by a trained youth.

Devoting all of his professional life to vocational education, Prosser gave numerous speeches and wrote articles, reports and books specifying his ideas and concerns. Ardently pursuing federal funding, he methodically argued the need for practical education. In addition, Prosser described all aspects of the program: types of programs; entrance requirements; curriculum; teacher qualifications and training. It is with this focus Prosser's concept of vocational education at the secondary-school level will be analyzed.

Need for the Program

In promoting vocational education Prosser emphasized that it would benefit the individual economically, socially, and educationally. Most persuasively, Prosser emphasized the need for vocational education in order that the nation maintain its global economic superiority as well as resolve over-riding social problems.

Economic Need

The production of wealth of any country, according to Prosser, was related to conservation and full utilization

of its natural resources and human labor. Both of these were dependent on vocational education. Vocational training would maintain the economic security of the country and the individual. It was needed:

> 1. To conserve and develop our natural resources; 2. to prevent waste of human labor; 3. to provide a supplement to apprenticeship; 4. to increase wage earning power; 5. to meet the increasing demand for trained workmen; 6. to offset the increased cost of living; 7. as a wise business investment; and 8. because our national prosperity is at stake.[3]

Efficient utilization of natural resources was an important aspect of Prosser's economic theory of vocational education. He stated that every country had only finite sources of raw materials, whether from natural assets or import. A nation's economic stability and advancement rested upon maximizing this capital through the development and application of scientific and technical knowledge. Dynamic vocational education training--responsive to technological advancements--would ensure the continued growth of the nation's financial status.[4]

Related to management of natural resources was full employment of the work force. Prosser proposed that vocational education could maximize the labor supply through the proper training of students. Such a program would decrease the number of those involuntarily unemployed, poorly trained, or untrained.[5]

Prosser lamented the decline of the apprenticeship plan and viewed vocational education as a means of

augmenting the program. He attributed this downfall as resulting from an apprentice's stagnating skills. A system of continuing education would secure for the worker access to the most current advances in his field. Without this approach, the employee was unprofitable to himself as well as to society.[6]

Vocational education was also needed to increase an individual's wage-earning potential, according to Prosser. With achievement of economic independence as one's goal, vocational training would increase wage-earning capacity through increased production of goods, supplies and services. A trained work-force would result in increased production that would diminish the effects of price escalation.[7]

As a means of advancing vocational education programs, Prosser emphasized its low dollar cost in relation to social and economic returns.[8] Providing specifics in terms of the actual cost of the program, he concluded that increased wages would compensate for the program's expense within two to five years.

Another important facet of Prosser's push for vocational education was concern over national prosperity. In 1914 he asserted:

> The battles of the future between nations will be fought in the markets of the world. That nation will triumph, with all that its success means to the happiness and welfare of its citizenship, which is able to put the greatest amount of skill and brains into what it produces. Our foreign

> commerce, and to some extent our domestic commerce, are being threatened by the commercial prestige which Germany has won, largely as the result of a policy of training its workers begun by the far-seeing Bismarck almost half a century ago.
>
> France and England, and even far-off Japan, profiting by the schools of the Fatherland, are now establishing national systems of vocational education. In Germany, within the next few years, there will probably be no such thing as the untrained man. In the United States probably not more than 25,000 of the eleven or twelve million workers in manufacturing and mechanical pursuits have had an opportunity to acquire an adequate training for their work in life.[9]

At the time that this was written, the United States observed an increasingly aggressive Germany. Fears concerning economic and political security were on the rise. It is of little doubt that this last argument for the necessity of vocational education, coupled with the proceeding ramifications as to societal betterment, led to the establishment of federal funding for vocational education.

Social and Educational Need

Prosser deemed vocational education as a way to democratize education and thus offset various societal ills. He believed that liberal education over-emphasized the Cardinal Principle of worthy use of leisure time and promoted an aristocratic concept of education (see Chapter II for a discussion of the *Cardinal Principles of Education*). The idea of a liberal education originated from the days when only the rulers of oligarchies enjoyed

leisurely pursuits and work was done by society's underclass. Prosser stated that a true democracy has equality as its main objective. Education that ignored the worker was far from egalitarian.[10]

According to Prosser, hallmarks of equality in education were

> when it renders a new and needed educational service to a neglected group of citizens; or when it extends an old service to neglected groups; or when it improves an old service to any group; or when it reduces the cost of any service so as to make it available to any group.[11]

Vocational education would provide equal educational opportunities for all by providing an education for those who were not benefitting from the liberal education course of studies. It would decrease the drop-out rate in the high schools by providing a curriculum that was not only of interest but of economic value. It would also enable the student to develop to his fullest potential and thus provide society with the highest return on monies expended for education. Through part-time and evening instruction, opportunities for learning would be available to those who were forced to leave school to earn an income.[12]

In terms of society as a whole, vocational education, according to Prosser, would limit industrial and social unrest. These civil disturbances were due in part to a lack of job mobility. As a result of the subdivision of labor in large scale operations, the untrained worker was confined to performing the same monotonous task, day in and

day out. Vocational education would provide this same worker with opportunities for advancement through additional training. The results of not offering such training were rising unemployment and an increase in criminal activity. All told, vocational education would ensure training in citizenship as well as job preparation, thereby reducing the possibility of an untrained populace becoming dependent or harmful citizens.[13]

Prosser believed vocational education to be of benefit to society through conserving the expenditure of human resources. An effective program would: within a shorter period of time, make learning and job performance more effortless; maximize the effectiveness of man working with machine; allow man to adapt to a new job due to advances in technology; permit the efficient dissemination of new procedures.[14]

In terms of individuals, Prosser emphasized that vocational education would increase their standard of living due to boosted earning power and the acquisition of an improved value system. The end result of people helping themselves would be `social uplift'.[15]

Benefits to the individual would also be realized by the transfer of learning of effective thinking habits. Transference was contingent upon the student's innate interests and efficiency of training procedures. Vocational education programs would provide the largest degree

of both, stated Prosser. He concluded, perhaps erroneously, that the interest levels of most individuals were greatest in regard to income earning, however he did not state where or how that conclusion was obtained. He added that effective thinking was based on internalization of the knowledge to be learned. Inherent in vocational training programs were visualization of facts (through hands-on instruction), and repetitive training--thereby offering a high degree of efficiency of learning.[16] Although not addressing the fact that general educational also emphasized repetitive instruction through memorization and drill, he concluded that the superiority of vocational education programs, in terms of developing and carrying-over thinking habits, could aid in managing societal problems.

Prosser contended vocational education contributed to morale--occupationally, individually and socially. Worker morale was considered an important factor in the success of a business. Vocational training promoted a sense of self-confidence and pride which influenced work productivity as well as individual stability. Singular stability would lead to societal equilibrium with vocational education as its impetus.[17]

In advancing his cause for vocational education, Prosser did not neglect the area of general education. At least overtly, his purpose for this program was not to use

it to replace the secondary school curriculum but to augment it. "General education always precedes vocational education which is built upon it," asserted Prosser.[18] Citing the need to provide a better teaching process for the slow and mentally handicapped learner, vocational training was offered as the answer. However, concrete and purposeful instruction would not only benefit the educationally impaired student but all students:

> The mission of vocational education is not only to provide definite training in the technique of the various occupations, but to relate that training closely to the science, mathematics, history, geography and literature which are useful to the man and woman as a worker and as a citizen. . . .
>
> By thus relating education closely to the world's experience it becomes purposeful and useful and enables the worker to see the significance of, to use, and to interpret in terms of his own experience, the knowledge and culture which the race has accumulated.[19]

In later years Prosser would attempt to modify the general education curriculum in the secondary schools through an infusion of his vocational education principles. This program would be known as life adjustment education (see Chapter IV).

Charles Prosser possessed the gift of rhetoric. Although he sometimes lacked the substantiation of facts, overgeneralized certain information, and tended to allow emotions to supersede educational theory, he was able to convince Congress to fund specific vocational education programs below the college grade level. Once this task was

completed he spent his remaining years in part, appealing for its acceptance by educators and the public.

Federal Funding

Federal funding for vocational education programs at the secondary level was established through the *Smith-Hughes Act*, also known as the *Vocational Education Act*.[20] Primarily written by Charles Prosser, it was almost a word for word restatement of the proposals delineated in the *Report of the Commission on National Aid to Vocational Education*.

The law established provisions of matching federal funds to cooperating states. Monies were to be used for teacher and administrator salaries and training programs. A cap of 50 per cent was set regarding salary reimbursement, thus assuring that adequate funds would be available for the training of teachers.

Funds for the *Smith-Hughes Act* were to be available beginning on June 30, 1918, and continue to grow for a nine year period when the maximum apportionment was reached. The purpose of this was to allow for the gradual development of vocational education programs. Once the maximum in appropriations had been achieved, further legislation was enacted in order to expand the funds made available to those taking advantage of the *Smith-Hughes Act* as well as to extend funding to Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia.[21]

In Smith-Hughes, the only subject areas to receive funding were: trade and industry, home economics, and agriculture. According to Prosser, the bill originally introduced to Congress was intended to fund only the two vocational fields of agriculture and trade and industry. Some funds were to be made available for home economics programs but not for teacher training. Congress amended the bill to include home economics in each area that referred to provisions for industry and trade. Agricultural programs and salary provisions remained in separate sections. Prosser had misgivings over this modification of the bill:

> No separate appropriation was made for home economics but the use of not more than 20 per cent of the trade and industrial education money allotted to a state was permitted for use in home economics. The full development of trade and industrial education was hampered somewhat by this curtailment of the funds intended, while home economics education was handicapped by aid which was quite insufficient and by operating standards and conditions which were unsuitable.[22]

However, he then added that subsequent bills enacted by Congress, all which mimicked the basic conditions of Smith-Hughes, provided further allocations for home economics as well as for distributive education.

There were three general restrictions to Smith-Hughes: (1) funding was limited to those public programs serving students over fourteen years of age, yet of less than college grade (this group would include adolescents as well as adults); (2) no funds were to be directly or indirectly

allocated for physical structures or equipment; (3) a Federal Board for Vocational Education was created to aid the States in carrying out the provisions of the Act (reimbursement of funds was contingent on the Board's approval of the State's plan concerning vocational education). Prosser maintained life-time convictions on each of these three points.

Believing far too much money had already been allocated for higher education programs, Prosser advocated limiting funding for those high school students who would not or should not attend college. Day, part-time and evening programs were to be established so as to meet the needs of everyone interested in vocational training.

Prosser's exclusion of funds for the repair or erection of any building was a result of his view once again, that excessive expenditures in this area had already turned high schools into palatial institutions. In terms of equipment for vocational education programs, funds were not needed. In order to be current, hands-on training was to take place at the actual work site.

Prosser's desire for a dual educational system was realized in the *Smith-Hughes Act*. With the creation of the Federal Board for Vocational Education, vocational education planners would no longer run the risk of interference from general educators. The Board's function was to supervise and assist States in developing and

maintaining their vocational education programs. Approval of funding was to come from the Board, however this changed in 1932 and 1933. Reductions in federal expenditures resulted in the Presidential order to transfer financial control to first, the Department of the Interior and then to the U.S. Commissioner of Education. Prosser, not pleased by this decision, stated that preference should have been given to creating a Federal Board of Education that would have merged both general and vocational education.[23] This concession, a complete reversal from his previously held view, was never heeded.

The provisions of the *Smith-Hughes Act* remained as a guiding force in vocational education until 1963, when the *Federal Vocational Act* was enacted. Rather than solely funding specific vocational areas, monies were made available to specific disadvantaged groups.

The net result of the *Smith-Hughes Act* was the establishment of public vocational education programs in all States. Enrollment in vocational education programs increased more than 1100 per cent from the year 1918 to 1945.[24] Even taking into account an increase in the high school age population during this time frame, it cannot be overlooked that Prosser's funding package played a significant role in advancing vocational education. Remaining in effect for forty-six years, the law would not be without its critics.

The principles underlying the *Smith-Hughes Act*, were based on previously mentioned social, economic and educational needs. Mirroring the many other reform movements occurring in the nation, the purpose of the act was to benefit society. For Charles Prosser, in creating a skilled work force out of those inadequately employed or unemployed, the purpose of the high school would be met: preparation for life.

Identifying the Population

Charles Prosser advanced vocational education programs for a large segment of the population. As stated in the *Smith-Hughes Act*, services were to be offered to students at the age of fourteen years and continue through adulthood, with the exclusion of college grade programs. Two of Prosser's theories regarding principles of effective vocational education programs, directly addressed student selection: success in vocational training related to students' abilities, interests, aptitudes and intelligence levels; and successful programs were dependent upon the appropriate selection of students.[25]

Student selection thus became a two-fold question: how to identify those students of secondary school age who would benefit from vocational education programs rather than the complete general education curriculum; and, how to determine which vocational education program would best

serve the student. Prosser's solution lay in prevocational guidance and training.

In 1925, Prosser formally defined prevocational training as

> all the experiences in the form of information, instruction, testing, advising and even placement in a job, given to an individual, which aid him in making an intelligent choice of an occupation or which train him for the occupation he selects.[26]

In essence, he promoted an eclectic approach which emphasized ability testing through job or task performance rather than through the use of intelligence tests. The thrust of such training would occur prior to job selection.[27]

Prevocational Guidance and Training

Appropriate and efficient selection of students for secondary level vocational education programs was the responsibility of those in the elementary schools. The lack of such guidance resulted in inappropriate selection of high school programs or premature termination of education in lieu of early employment. In both instances, students stood at risk of becoming burdens or even menaces upon society.[28]

Another result of the lack of early vocational guidance was the tendency for vocational education programs becoming a repository for students unsuccessful in mainstream education. Angered by this, Prosser stated:

> The greatest difficulty in public vocational education today is that the vocational school in many communities has been made the dumping ground of all the misfits of the school system, who because they have failed to meet requirements in the general schools are regarded as the proper material out of which to make competent mechanics. It requires brains to become a good mechanic, strange as this seems in some quarters.[29]

As a means of alleviating the aforementioned difficulties, Prosser proposed a plan for vocational guidance and training. Initially the plan was focused on the twelve to fourteen year old student. Later he would find it necessary to revise this.

Prosser's early program consisted of students selecting a future area of concentration for their high school studies: college preparation, commercial, household arts or practical arts. He did not specify as to how students came to their decision but most likely, family finances and preferences were influential factors. During the seventh and eighth grades, all students would spend a maximum of half the school day in general studies such as English, history and civics. The balance of time was to be spent taking a series of short courses pertaining to their future field of study. Vocational courses were to provide experiences as similar to the work place as feasible. Whenever possible, arrangements were to be made for the student to visit actual work sites.

It was Prosser's plan that this differentiated course of study would provide the student and school counselor

with concrete information as to the aptitudes, interests and ability levels of the student. Through this information the student would then be able to be guided to the appropriate educational program.[30] Thus the initial plan of guidance and training became one of guidance *through* prevocational training. In later years, Prosser adjusted the age range of this program.

As the minimum age of employment rose, an increasing number of adolescents continued their education past the elementary school level. This and factors concerning the younger student's physical and mental maturity led Prosser to alter the age boundaries for prevocational training. He now recommended it for the group aged fourteen to sixteen years.[31] Although Prosser considered the adolescent mind immature and unstable, by default, he deemed this as the appropriate time to provide prevocational instruction:

> It is very important that effective prevocational training should precede vocational training and that vocational training should accompany or precede actual entrance into employment. This means that prevocational training, if it is to be opportune and therefore helpful to the mass of our young people, must be given in the earlier stages of adolescence.[32]

Once a student's ability levels and interests were determined, a vocational training program could be selected, suitable to the student's needs. However, regardless of which program model was chosen, Prosser insisted that administrative control be maintained separate from that of general education programs.

Administration

Two concepts of administrative control over vocational education existed. The theory of single unit control placed administrative responsibility for both general and vocational education within the same federal, state or local governing body. Proponents of this system believed it sound for several reasons. A single regulatory body would ensure that democratic principles would prevail. Students would have equal access to both educational programs and the possibility of class distinctions arising over program selection would be minimized. It was also believed that those in general education, by virtue of years of experience, were better able to supervise such programs. Not to be overlooked was the economics of a single versus a dual organizational system.[33]

The principle behind the dual administrative system was that effective control over general and vocational education programs demanded separate units of authority. It was of this theory that Charles Prosser was a staunch advocate. Many of the reasons that he offered supporting dual control, were merely a means of ensuring that the incipient weaknesses of the general education programs--those that he had spoken against for years--would not become inherent in vocational programs.

Prosser believed separate authoritative bodies were necessary due to each groups' adherence to diverse theories of learning, as well as purpose of education.[34] Those in general education paid heed to the `old' theory of mental powers while those in vocational education believed in learning as the result of acquiring new habits. Habit psychology dispelled ideas concerning transfer of training. Since those in general education had no experience in this learning model, to support a single governing unit would jeopardize the integrity of vocational training. Correspondent to this was disparity in purpose of education.

The emphasis in general education according to Prosser, was training for culture--a view he maintained as elitist for several reasons previously stated: the large majority of students would not benefit from a curriculum designed hundreds of years in the past; most students were not in need of college preparatory coursework as they would not or should not be attending college; the true purpose of an education was preparation for intelligent citizenship which meant acquiring knowledge of economic self-sufficiency as a means of benefitting the nation. With educational aims in opposition, fair treatment of both could only be assured through separate administrative units.

In listing his reasons why governance of vocational and general education programs should remain apart, Prosser

somewhat benevolently added two that most general educators had difficulty disputing. The first was that general educators were already so overburdened with their own programs that it would be unfair to add the responsibility of supervising a new program in the experimental stages of development. The other reason was the precarious nature of educational funding. Appropriations stood to be greater with the two groups being autonomous.

Over the objections of detractors, the *Smith-Hughes Act* reinforced the theory of dual control by stipulating the creation of the Federal Board for Vocational Education. In subsequent years, control over general and vocational education would again be merged; however, the existent antipathy would remain.

Types of Programs

Charles Prosser supported three service delivery models in vocational education. Students were to begin programs no earlier than the age of fourteen years (pursuant with federal funding guidelines) and continue through adulthood, as needed. Prosser delineated the three programs as follows:

> 1. Persons, usually of secondary school age, who are in full time school attendance for the purpose of acquiring the abilities, knowledge, and information needed to prepare them to enter some specific job or occupation. The needs of this group are usually served by all day schools or classes.

> 2. Young workers who have left the regular full time schools and have entered employment as learners or apprentices but who return to school for a part of their time to secure training which will improve their vocational knowledge or ability, or their civic intelligence. This group is served by the type of school or class usually known as "part time."
>
> 3. Adults who are primarily full time workers but who return to the vocational schools outside of their usual working hours in order to secure further training in the job or field of work in which they are, or have been employed. Their needs are usually met in the school organization known as the evening school or class.[35]

Thus, program selection became a function not only of age but of employment status. For the purposes here of analyzing Prosser's ideas of vocational education in the secondary schools, only the first two groups will be addressed.

Adolescent Day School Programs

The full time day school program was designed to provide occupational training for students prior to gainful employment. Prosser considered this type of school as essential:

> A system of education which does not provide all-day schools for boys and girls who desire training for an industrial pursuit before entering it may justly be charged with driving them out of the schools and into the factories and workshops.[36]

Typically serving the fourteen to eighteen year old student, a split program was devised in order to meet vocational as well as general education goals. Approximately 85 percent of the school day was to be

devoted to vocational instruction with the balance concerned with general education and civic training.[37] "In this way the school will make for intelligent and worthy citizenship as will as for superior workmanship," said Prosser when describing the basis for a split course of study.[38] As a result, two types of schools emerged: cooperative and non-cooperative.

The cooperative approach, preferred by Prosser, typically involved a weekly time rotation between the school and actual work site in which the student would be paid for work performed. The premise behind this organizational plan was that the closer the training resembled the actual working environment, the more profitable that training would be to the student. However problems sometimes arose between employers, whose concern was efficient production, and educators, whose primary objective was instruction--hence, the establishment of an alternative model.[39]

The non-cooperative school established shops which replicated actual working conditions as much as possible. As in the cooperative school, the student rotated between regular and shop classes. The short comings of this model, as expressed by Prosser were severe:

> The relation of a student to a teacher, for example, can never be exactly that of a worker to a foreman. Grave difficulties have been found in keeping such school shops supplied with actual up-to-date equipment and in turning out real commercial products that meet market demands as

> to speed, in production, quantity of output and quality of goods. Another difficulty which has seriously affected the non-cooperative school has been the fact that it has, as a rule, provided no means whereby learners can earn money during the process of training.[40]

Prosser's propensity toward the cooperative school was in keeping with his philosophy of education regarding aversion to artificiality in instruction. This preference would be evidenced in all aspects of his work in general education, specifically secondary, as well as vocational education.

Not only did Prosser have concerns regarding the organization of the adolescent day school, but he was loathe to see its resemblance to the general high school program in any way except in student age similarities. Effective vocational schools replaced letter or percentage ability grading with successful completion of tasks. Admission was continuous on a year-round basis for students with the ability and desire, rather than twice-yearly entry for those bearing a grammar school diploma. Group class work was replaced by individual instruction given by specially trained teachers. Whereas regular schools promoted students on the basis of fixed time units, adolescent schools adhered to performance standards alone. Discipline was maintained through personnel management techniques as opposed to `police control' methods used in the regular schools.[41] Prosser's concern regarding general education would eventually spill over to attempts at revising the entire focus of that program (see Chapter IV).

In 1925, Prosser's position changed somewhat on the importance of the day school. Believing it reached only the limited group of students not choosing the general high school program or immediate employment, he doubted its scope as a democratizing agent.[42] A program more likely to affect a larger population would be part time vocational education programs.

Part Time Programs

A large part of Charles Prosser's work in vocational education was related to the already employed adolescent or adult in need of continuing career education. He viewed this group as historically neglected by those in the field of vocational education and yet a group in desperate need for services. Necessary were programs that provided new technical skills in order that workers remain up-to-date in their present field. Retraining programs were needed for the worker unemployed as a result of technological advancements. Dictated also, were programs for employed youths who prematurely terminated their educations.

Prosser's recommendations as to the types of part time programs required to meet the needs of working adolescents, changed over the course of the years. Initially these programs concentrated on the needs of fourteen to eighteen year old youths who left school early in order to work. Comparable to the adolescent day school, the controlling purpose was to promote vocational and civic intelligence.[43]

Often referred to as continuation schools, they flourished until the period surrounding the Depression. Massive unemployment led to demands banning employment of the young worker. As a means of ensuring this, attendance laws were enacted mandating school enrollment until the age of sixteen years. By World War II, the population now to be served by part time vocational education programs was of age sixteen to twenty one years.[44] Instruction concentrated on vocational rather than citizenship training as a result of the country's growing technological needs. The types of programs that emerged were apprenticeship and diversified cooperative training.

Apprenticeship

National apprehension over the dearth of trained workmen in the United States as compared to Germany influenced a revival of apprenticeship programs. This concern was strongly felt by Charles Prosser. In 1937, a law was passed creating the Federal Committee on Apprenticeship, under the auspices of the Department of Labor. Its purpose was not to fund or administer apprenticeship programs, but to promote standards and cooperation between labor and management in establishing such training.

Several models of apprenticeship emerged, however Prosser identified certain characteristics as mandatory for the plan's success. Student selection was to be based on ability and not nepotism. Instructional time was a minimum

of four hours per week for four years and related to the apprentice's trade, not college preparation. Competent and adequate supervision of training was required. Without such guidance, the program would fail as had occurred in the past. Principles of habit psychology were to be implemented in order to maximize learning. Imperative were teachers experienced in their trade and skillful in instruction.[45]

Diversified Cooperative Training

Deriving the name from its purpose of preparing students to enter diverse fields of employment, Prosser viewed diversified cooperative training as a successor to the cooperative training plan of the 1920s and '30s. Students between the ages of sixteen and eighteen years, enrolled in general high schools, divided their day between school-arranged employment and course work. General education subjects were taught two periods a day. One additional period of group or individual instruction, was given pertaining to employment concerns. Similar to apprenticeship programs, interplay and cooperation between employers and educators were important to the success of this approach.[46]

Prosser's approval of diversified cooperative training was definite as he deemed it of great value to community and country as well as to individual students. He considered it a viable alternative for the student who was

not college bound and yet wished to be prepared for an occupation after high school graduation. Whereas the student engaged in paid employment as part of the instructional plan, techniques of money management were thus learned. Society benefitted through keeping students in school who might otherwise become delinquents. Most important to Prosser, public education was democratized by providing life preparedness instead of solely college preparation.[47]

Curriculum

The curriculum was of great import to Charles Prosser and many of his theories of vocational education related directly to specific areas within this topic. Using the term `subject matter', his definition was, "The entire range of experiences through which the learner progresses in attaining a specific doing ability of a predetermined character."[48] Therefore, curriculum referred not only to particular subjects to be mastered within an occupation but also to subject content, course organization and instructional methods.

Central to all areas of vocational study, was Prosser's rejection of classical subjects. He maintained that theories of habit psychology negated the concept of mental powers and thus the pedagogical value of subjects such as foreign languages and literature was limited. At best, Prosser saw their value as college preparatory. In

his discussion concerning the provision of classical studies at the Boston Mechanical Arts High School, Prosser stated:

> However important instruction in these subjects may be as part of a general education or as preparation for college, they have no more to do with the business of manufacturing than have Latin, Greek, or any other cultural subject and do not belong in the curriculum of a special school whose aim is to train prospective officers of industry.[49]

The course of study in vocational education, including related subjects, was not to rely on abstract knowledge but have specific application to the targeted employment field. Common to each content area was the organization of such training and methods of instruction.

Course of Study

Prosser directed, in his twelfth theory of vocational education, that subjects taught in vocational education be specific to distinct occupational areas.[50] He adhered to the four major funding categories as stipulated in the *Smith-Hughes Act* (trade, industry, agriculture, home economics), but divided them into specific employment areas. Each area was then sub-divided into units of instruction. Prosser's ideas regarding this are evidenced in the 1915-16 Dunwoody Industrial Institute Prospectus.[51]

Under the category of Shop Work, one of the employment fields listed was Automobile Construction. Eighteen separate units comprised this field of study, with each

guided by a series of objectives. An example can be found in the following unit:

> VIII. MOTOR--Making a study of different types of motors, 2-cycle and 4-cycle. How they are adjusted. Cause of knocks and ways of finding them. Why motors fail.
> (a) Crank case.
> (b) Crank shaft and bearings; fly wheel.
> (c) Connecting rod and bearings--scraping and fitting bearings.
> (d) Cylinders and pistons.
> (e) Valve lifting mechanism--cams, eccentrics.
> (f) Manifolds--exhaust and inlet.
> (g) Water jackets and piping.
> (h) Timing valves--rotary and slide valves.
> (i) Gears, chains and shafts--spiral.
> (j) Pressure and heat--heat transmission.
> (k) Horsepower.[52]

Associated with the units of study was course content. Prosser delineated two components of effective vocational training: those which met, at the very least, minimum standards of employment; and those that trained individuals to meet market requirements rather than idealized standards.[53] Stated as his eighth and ninth theory of vocational education, Prosser maintained their relevance not only to guide vocational studies, but to determine associated courses.

One-half of each school day was to consist of actual shop work such as the above, with the balance of time spent in classroom instruction devoted to related studies. The purpose of this auxiliary instruction was to enable the student to achieve the goal of civic as well as vocational intelligence.

During the early part of Prosser's career, the prescribed related studies were similar in name to standard high school subjects. However, practical application to employment fields was highlighted. Again, the 1915-16 Dunwoody Prospectus provides examples of this.

Shop mathematics and English were two of the seven ancillary courses mandatory for all students enrolled in Shop Work.[54] Units in mathematics were similarly termed to those in the general high school curriculum (arithmetic, geometry, algebra, etc.) although, practical application to the trade was emphasized.

ARITHMETIC

> Operation No.1--Fractions: reduction, addition and subtraction (Such problems will be given as: what is a 5/8" drill in thirty-seconds? or: if a 3/4" drill is 1-16" oversize, what size is required?)
>
> Operation No.2.--Fractions: multiplication and division (Such problems as: Which would cost more a cast iron machine part weighing 5 1/2 lbs, at 3 1/2 c a pound or a 2 2/3 lbs, cast steel part at 7 1/2 c a pound? or, water weighs 62 1/2 lbs, per cubic foot, and there are 7 1/2 gallons in a cubic foot, what is the weight of a gallon of water? . . .[55]

The study of English consisted of units in spelling, letter writing, oral expression and composition. All elements of this study accentuated business applications such as spelling technical terms and writing letters in regard to machine repair or ordering materials.[56]

By the 1930s, Prosser's growing emphasis on utility of *all* instruction in terms of life preparation, led to

modifications of this curriculum. In response to a question by Merle Curti as to the non-vocational needs for those enrolled in vocational education studies, Prosser responded:

> Of course there is great need for what you would call non-vocational help. The help needed, however, is not the usual academic idea as to subject matter, but real functioning material with regard to all such things having to do with the real problems of living as these:
>
> (1) Health and its preservation.
> (2) Keeping physically fit.
> (3) Wise expenditure of funds.
> (4) Thrift and savings.
> (5) Taking care of your money.
> (6) Investing money safely.
> (7) Saving for a `rainy day'.
> (8) Getting a job.
> (9) Getting along with the boss and fellow workmen.
> (10) Winning promotion and planning a career.
> (11) Getting the reading habit.
> (12) Improving one's English.[57]

Prosser's growing concern was that the university continued to dictate the curriculum of all secondary studies to the detriment of those students seeking a job upon receipt of their diploma. For these students, employment survival skills, sound thinking habits, and maintaining personal finances provided better training of the mind than disciplinary courses such as history or literature. Prosser also maintained that the methods of instruction used in the general high school curriculum were of little value to those enrolled in vocational education programs. The regular school's reliance on teaching

meaningless subjects (`cold storage' knowledge), most often led to the student's inability to retain information. Upon development of an appropriate curriculum, application of instructional methods designed to enhance learning would further ensure the success of a vocational education program.

Instructional Methods

According to Prosser, modern learning theory dictated that transfer of training was limited to those areas most closely related to targeted instruction. The transmission of knowledge therefore, was enhanced in direct proportion to the extent that it replicated the work environment in terms of conditions, tools, and thought habits.[58]

The most effective training occurred on the job. If this type of setting could not be secured, then school training was to replicate the preferred setting to the greatest degree possible. This meant that students were to dress in the same fashion, use the same tools, have experience on the same machinery, and produce real products as did actual workers in the field.[59] Strict care was to be taken that school equipment be kept up-to-date. Prosser wrote, "Obsolescent equipment is almost as bad as an obsolescent instructor, courses of instruction and methods of training."[60]

Effective training was also related to direct and specific instruction in the same thinking and manipulative

habits as workmen. Enumerated as his third theory of vocational education, Prosser believed every occupation to consist of distinct `thinking and doing' habits that needed to be mastered. As an example, Prosser compared the needs of the plumber to those of the carpenter:

> A plumber works with wood to a very limited extent in cutting holes for pipes and in anchoring fixtures, but his whole thinking about the matter as a craftsman is entirely different from that of a carpenter. The latter constructs out of wood while the former, who constructs out of metal parts, looks upon wood only as an obstacle and often as a nuisance.[61]

Occupational training was to teach only those relevant and explicit habits unique to each field.

Associated to acquisition of correct thought habits, was repetition of instruction. Employment was based on the mastery of habits and only through repeated practice could the worker achieve any degree of skill. Just as repetitive training made for a skilled surgeon, so too would it make for an experienced carpenter.[62]

Effective instruction was contingent on the instructor's ability to appropriately impart the information to the student. Prosser saw this occurring in four steps. First the student was prepared for the lesson by given notice of the product that would result. Next, the teacher would present directions as to the needed tools, materials, and methods of operations. The student's application of this instruction was the third step. The final step was termed `testing' with the instructor appraising the

student's work. Important aspects of this instruction were: class discussion takes the place of formal lecture; students learn self-reliance in instruction; trade literature replaces the sole use of textbooks; and, shop experience becomes the center of all learning.[63]

Productive teaching devices, for Prosser consisted of any concrete tool that would prove beneficial to learning:

> Job instruction sheets, Information sheets, manuals, reference books and pamphlets, check sheets, manufacturers' catalogues, the four-step lesson, boxhead analysis, lesson outlines, lesson plans, job reports. . . . Demonstrations, charts, diagrams, slides, movies, cutaway parts, models, manufacturers' demonstration equipment.[64]

Not merely did Prosser specify the types of experiences and devices necessary to effect maximized instruction in vocational education programs, but he also detailed the course organization.

Important to vocational education training was individualized instruction. This could best be attained in a course structure different from that utilized in the regular high school. The plan advocated by Prosser combined the short unit course in conjunction with the project method of instruction.

The short unit course was distinct from the long course in that instruction was organized into a progression of small segments or units (in the long course, instruction was continuous over a six month to four year time period).[65] Prosser believed that this type of organization

provided for greater elasticity in meeting the needs of the students. He offered the following illustration:

> In one school, the entire training course for each occupation is divided up into a series of sixty-minute days. A boy who enters the school takes the first unit. If he remains, he takes the second and third in order. On the other hand, he may drop out of the school for a period to earn some money; return to school and take another unit or units. According to his means, he may ultimately work through the entire training course, taking as much time as he needs. . . .[66]

Benefits of this type of organization were that even when enrollment was not consecutive, students gained financially from what had already been learned. In addition, they were able to return to the training program without repeating instruction as would occur in the long course. As the course structure would suggest, schools utilizing this plan maintained continuous registration of students throughout the year.[67]

The short course was not to be used alone but concomitantly with the project method of instruction. The basis of the plan was selection of a single, dominant subject such as a specific job in shop training. All related knowledge, such as occupational mathematics, science, and safety procedures, was furnished to the student at that point. Prosser theorized that real job intelligence required doing (practice at the task) and thinking about the doing (knowledge). This instructional model enhanced learning by demonstrating to the student the

relationship of knowledge to skill.[68] Avoided would be `cold storage' knowledge.

Since all learning was related, Prosser advocated the use of one instructor to teach all phases of each unit. This model stood in contrast to the departmental plan utilized in the general secondary program, of which Prosser found antithetical to the principles guiding vocational education. Whereas those in general high schools viewed subjects as independent units needed for mental discipline, vocational training experts saw learning as purposeful and interrelated to associated subject areas.[69]

Prosser's ideas concerning the curriculum were exact, detailed, and in divergence with those of secondary educators engaged in general studies. Accordingly, he maintained specific opinions as to teacher qualifications and training procedures. For Prosser, the teacher was the predominant factor leading to a successful vocational education program.

Teacher Training

Prosser stated that efficient instruction in vocational education at the secondary level, resulted from the individual's mastery of occupational content and pedagogical skill. He recognized three distinct teacher training plans, each designed to meet the needs of those individuals enrolled. The first plan was designed to provide the totally inexperienced student, with both occupational as

well as teaching techniques. Another plan was to offer occupational training to the otherwise trained teacher from another subject area. The third plan addressed the needs of the already skilled worker by offering the required teaching skills. It was this last plan that Prosser wholeheartedly endorsed. His reasons were many, however they all filtered down to his belief that occupational competency could only be attained through prior work experience.[70]

Prosser maintained that training institutions were incapable of providing occupational skills to the extent of those possessed by the experienced worker. Shopwork training was artificial and at best, an inefficient method of providing occupational training. Not enough time could ever be spent at shopwork to be commensurate with the skill possessed by the apprentice with an additional four years of actual work experience.[71]

Prosser also challenged the curriculum of typical training institutions such as State universities, State agricultural and mechanical colleges, and engineering colleges. He deemed the trade and professional content of the curricula as functionally weak. Courses such as algebra, geometry and trigonometry were inappropriately taught in terms of application. Generally speaking these courses were even unnecessary as most students came from secondary educational programs that provided the

mathematical skills needed for vocational instruction.[72]

As to teaching content, Prosser stated:

> Only 9% of the student's time is applied to all subjects having to do even remotely with the problems of teaching and less than 6% of his time to all subjects having even ostensibly any real or vital connection with the pedagogy and methods of the industrial or trade school.[73]

He laid the blame for the inadequacies and inappropriateness of the curriculum on the university. Instead of developing new courses and hiring new teachers when confronted with a unique area of study, courses were assembled from existing programs to be taught by the same teachers.[74]

The curriculum Prosser supported was one designed to meet the needs of the already experienced worker. He noted many similarities between this individual and the skilled teacher. Therefore the purpose of the training program was merely that of providing the missing elements necessary to ensure competent teaching. The particular course of study depended upon the individual's area of specialization. However, it was characterized by the following objectives:

> I. The ability to visualize content "on demand"--that is, the ability, as required, to analyze the occupation or any of its operations and determine the things in skill or related knowledge that need to be taught the learner.
>
> II. The ability to carry on instructing processes, as used in vocational education.
>
> III. The ability to isolate teaching units -- that is, the ability to break up the trade or occupations into distinct phases or units of

operations and processes and related knowledge that need to be taught.

IV. The ability to set up progressive courses of instruction--that is, the ability to organize courses of training in the way the learner can progress most successfully.

V. The ability to deal with learners effectively under school conditions.

VI. The ability to distinguish between vocational education and other forms of education.

VII. An understanding of the economic and sociological functions of vocational education.

VIII. A knowledge of legislation affecting the work of teachers, especially their work in States and Federal aided schools.[75]

Utilizing these objectives, including a period of supervised practice teaching, the length of this training program ranged from sixty to one hundred hours.[76]

The crux of Prosser's model for teacher training was the emphasis upon employing the already skilled worker--a policy he endorsed during his long tenure as Director of Dunwoody Industrial Institute. When criticized by the university for this preference, Prosser responded with anger. He viewed these attacks as mere prejudice against those people who earned their living with their hands. He also saw the university as trying to protect their own interests by recommending college courses (taught by college instructors) and the employment of graduates from their institutions.[77]

Prosser was dogmatic in his belief that only the working man could adequately train students in vocational education--an opinion he would continue to maintain with regard to the general high school program. The curriculum he suggested for training teachers of vocational education was vague and undeveloped yet most likely, his intention. His assuredness and attention to detail in all other aspects concerning vocational education, makes it unlikely that the program's lack of definition was due to omission or vagueness of thought. Most probably, Prosser did not want to detail the specifics as to the course of study for training educators, as it was extremely limited in depth. Although Prosser espoused the belief that teaching efficiency resulted from occupational competency as well as teaching ability, the latter was certainly held as subordinate in importance to the former. To reveal this would risk denunciation from most educators--vocational or otherwise. Prosser already had his share of critics. To add to the number could have meant rejection of his ideas, in total.

Critics

Vocational education at the secondary level was not without its critics. As one of the most prominent and vocal advocates in the field, many of the criticisms were leveled specifically at Charles Prosser. Concerns centered around the purpose of vocational education and student

selection which in turn raised questions regarding the policy of dual administration.

Purpose of Vocational Education

Prosser viewed the purpose of vocational education primarily in economic terms. The individual was to be trained for useful and marketable employment through a learning environment, instructional methodology, and teacher qualifications, which duplicated existing industrial conditions as much as possible. Adherence to the economic status quo was an idea that some educators held in contention.

John Dewey never directly criticized Prosser, however, he did question basic concepts which Prosser proposed. Dewey maintained that vocational education should be used as a tool to transform society and develop an individual's potential to its fullest. According to Dewey, the value of any social institution

> is the extent to which they educate every individual into the full stature of his possibility. Democracy has many meanings, but if it has a moral meaning, it is found in resolving that the supreme test of all political institutions and industrial arrangements shall be the contribution they make to the all-around growth of every member of society.[78]

Dewey saw vocational education as limited in scope and centered around machine operations rather than the application of industrial intelligence to solve social problems

and improve conditions. In response to a critical letter by David Snedden, Dewey wrote:

> The kind of vocational education in which I am interested is not one which will "adapt" workers to the existing industrial regime; I am not sufficiently in love with the regime for that. It seems to me that the business of all who would not be educational time-servers is to resist every move in this direction, and to strive for a kind of vocational education which will first alter the existing industrial system, and ultimately transform it.[79]

Dewey's concerns went unheeded as did those of other educational philosophers who saw the purpose of education as a path towards societal reform. Historically, schools proved to be poor tools in this pursuit. Prosser's view of vocational education was well-suited to society during the first half of the century. It was not until the 1960s, that a major policy shift would occur. Competency based education utilizing industrial standards continued to be promoted. However, emphasis on extending educational opportunities to disadvantaged and neglected individuals of society became the focus of the new trend in vocational education.[80] While Prosser promoted vocational education as available to all, in reality it was not. This was particularly true to critics of his policies regarding student selection.

Student Selection

Prosser encouraged vocational guidance for students of age fourteen to sixteen years. As a means of identifying

specific aptitudes and interests, he supported a strategy which combined the use of prevocational training, occupational testing and textual information regarding various vocations. Once interests and abilities were determined, direct vocational training could then begin at age sixteen.[81] Critics took issue with the age of onset for vocational training and as to when this guidance should occur.

John Dewey stated that narrow trade-training not begin until the age eighteen or twenty. Offered before this age, it amounted to social predestination. In partial agreement was Owen Lovejoy, general secretary of the National Child-Labor Committee. In 1913 he insisted that vocational guidance not start until the age of fourteen. Not until this age was a student capable of making a wise decision regarding future job choices.[82] He stated:

> To enter deliberately upon an educational policy which classifies little children into those destined for the professions and other pleasant callings on the one hand, and those destined as manual laborers on the other is to attempt a cleavage in society which is a direct contradiction of all our theories of democracy.[83]

These concerns may have provided impetus for Prosser to modify his original position on prevocational guidance and vocational training. Whereas in 1912 he advocated advisement initiating at the age of twelve, by 1925 he proposed that this not begin before the age of fourteen. In agreement that early adolescence was a period of

instability for youth, Prosser contended that social and economic demands necessitated vocational guidance and training at even this young an age.[84] Not only was age a point of contention in guidance but also the population to be served and the types of training to be offered.

Merle Curti questioned Prosser as to the criticism that vocational education was concerned "only with the `aristocracy of labor', the highly skilled, and the exceptionally able worker."[85] Clearly perturbed, Prosser responded that if Curti meant vocational educators now paid careful heed to selecting those students who would be successful in such a program, then the charge was justified. Vocational educators needed to be discerning in their standards of student selection in order not to waste social resources:

> Not every one, even if he were capable, can be trained for a skilled occupation. Even if every one could be so trained, the proposal would be worse than foolish because it would result in disaster. Public funds would be wasted on the pre-training of youth for employment which they could not obtain, and the occupation become overcrowded with the resulting effects of lowered wage and unemployment.[86]

For Prosser, the selection of a future vocation was not merely that of student preference. This choice needed to be measured against its impact upon the economy. Although not an advocate of social predestination, Prosser did view one of the functions of the school as guiding the student toward appropriate educational choices. Related to

charges of elitism in the selection of students, was apprehension regarding separatism between general and vocational education.

The Policy of Dual Administration

Charles Prosser urged that the direction, supervision, and management of vocational education be the responsibility of those within this field and not connected with the area of general education. John Dewey stood in opposition to this idea. He stated,

> A separation of trade education and general education of youth has the inevitable tendency to make both kinds of training narrower, less significant and less effective than the schooling in which the material of traditional education is reorganized to utilize the industrial subject matter--active, scientific and social--of the present-day environment.[87]

In agreement were the findings of John Russell in his 1938 analysis of vocational education. He reported that the narrowness and specificity of the *Smith-Hughes Act* promoted the idea of general education and vocational education as distinctly dissimilar. It tended to support the European concept of separate schooling for the working class and the elite, which was the antithesis of the American objective of a unified school system. Russell found the ramifications of this idea to be undemocratic and unwise. A concept of elitism was fostered. In some instances, monies for vocational programs were made available at the expense of general education programs, in order

to benefit from federal matching funds. The federal provision mandating three consecutive hours daily of vocational instruction resulted in adjusting the general program to meet this requirement. Russell also criticized that separate teacher training classes promoted alienation between teaching groups.[88] Associated to this was concern regarding pedagogical weakness in the teacher training curriculum.

In 1984, William Camp and John Hillison doubted the efficacy of Prosser's ideas concerning teacher training. Prosser viewed pedagogical skills as less important than knowledge of content. Camp and Hillison, noting that this idea was still given credence by vocational educators, maintained:

> Clearly, the vocational teacher who has weak subject matter expertise and weak pedagogical skills will fail. However, the vocational teacher who has mediocre subject matter expertise and great pedagogical skills may well succeed. The converse is probably not true, in that a master of a trade who has no pedagogical ability will never be able to succeed as a teacher. To overemphasize one side of the scale is to shortchange both the profession and the students.[89]

Although the authors were justified in this criticism, Prosser would have disagreed.

All of the results of a dual administrative policy, seen by others in the negative, were viewed by Prosser as quite the opposite. It was Prosser's exact intent to free

vocational education from any damaging influences of the general education program.

For Prosser, the hallmark of a successful vocational school was the removal of any vestige of the general secondary school program. His concerns were many regarding secondary education tainting vocational education. Perhaps as a result, his latter focus on altering the general high school curriculum occurred for two reasons.

Those attending a regular high school would benefit by a change of an added vocational emphasis. Those enrolled in vocational programs also would gain. No longer would general educators see the need to interfere with the vocational program.

Prosser may have rationalized that a general curriculum infused with the principles and methodologies of vocational education, would lessen the antagonism between the two groups. A modified curriculum would also serve to reduce the influence of the university in determining the course of study within the high school.

Conclusion

Prosser's ideas concerning vocational education served multiple purposes. His version of social efficiency was realized through establishing the function of schools as serving society. Democracy in education was attained by providing a high school program that was of benefit to all students and not just those who would later attend college.

The curriculum and instructional methods he advocated were task-specific and experientially oriented, thereby giving evidence to his disbelief in transfer of training. His plan for vocational education was also confirmation of his disdain towards the traditional secondary school program with its emphasis on classical subjects.

Prosser did not view his educational model as applicable solely for the area of vocational education. So sure was he that specific and practical subjects were the need of all students, they became central to his plan of life adjustment education. In the following chapter Prosser's ideas concerning general secondary education will be discussed.

CHAPTER THREE NOTES

[1] Report of the Commission on National Aid to Vocational Education, Vol. 1, by Hoke Smith, Chairman (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1914), 16.

[2] Charles Allen Prosser, "Then and Now: Twenty-eight Years and the Smith-Hughes Act," Address given at the Seventy-fifth Anniversary of the Colorado A. and M. College, 10 July 1945, Typewritten Document, Special Collection, Dunwoody Industrial Institute, Minneapolis, 2.

[3] Ibid., 8; and Report of the Commission on National Aid to Vocational Education, 18-23.

[4] Charles Allen Prosser and Charles R. Allen, Vocational Education in a Democracy (New York: Century Co., 1925), 19-22; A revised edition of this book was published in 1949, by Charles Prosser and Thomas Quigley. Subsequent notes will refer to the edition from which the material is derived.

[5] Report of the Commission on National Aid to Vocational Education, 19.

[6] See Prosser and Allen, Vocational Education in a Democracy (1925), 27-28; and Report of the Commission on National Aid to Vocational Education, 19-20.

[7] See Report of the Commission on National Aid to Vocational Education, 20-21; and Charles Allen Prosser, "Vocational Education as Life Adjustment," Presentation given to the Wisconsin Educational Association, 1936 or 1937, Typewritten Document, Special Collection, Dunwoody Industrial Institute, Minneapolis, 1-2.

[8] Report of the Commission on National Aid to Vocational Education, 21-22.

[9] Ibid., 22-23.

[10] Charles Allen Prosser and Thomas H. Quigley, Vocational Education in a Democracy, rev. ed. (Chicago: American Technical Society, 1949), 14-16; The first edition of this book was published in 1925, by Charles Prosser and Charles Allen. Subsequent notes will refer to the edition from which the material is derived.

[11] Ibid., 524.

[12] Report of the Commission on National Aid to Vocational Education, 23-24.

[13] Ibid., 25-26.

[14] Prosser and Allen, Vocational Education in a Democracy (1925), 150-187.

[15] Report of the Commission on National Aid to Vocational Education, 26.

[16] Prosser and Allen, Vocational Education in a Democracy (1925), 47-55.

[17] Ibid., 56-61.

[18] Charles Allen Prosser, "The Meaning of Industrial Education," Vocational Education, (May 1913): 402.

[19] Report of the Commission on National Aid to Vocational Education, 25.

[20] Vocational Education Act, Statutes at Large, XXXIX, (1917).

[21] Prosser and Quigley, Vocational Education in a Democracy (1949), 436-39.

[22] Ibid., 450-51.

[23] Layton S. Hawkins, Charles A. Prosser and John C. Wright, Development of Vocational Education (Chicago: American Technical Society, 1951), 156-61.

[24] Prosser and Quigley, Vocational Education in a Democracy (1949), 458.

[25] Prosser and Allen, Vocational Education in a Democracy (1925), 198. See APPENDIX A for a list of Prosser's sixteen theories of vocational education.

[26] Ibid., 134.

[27] Prosser also was a staunch advocate of continuing vocational training for the adult. For information concerning this aspect of Prosser's program, see: Prosser and Allen, Vocational Education in a Democracy (1925), Chapter XII; and, Prosser and Quigley, Vocational Education in a Democracy (1949), Chapter XII.

[28] Charles Allen Prosser, "Practical Arts and Vocational Guidance," in Journal of Proceedings and Addresses of the Fiftieth Annual Meeting Held in Chicago, July 6-12, 1912, by the National Education Association (Ann Arbor: National Education Association, 1912), 646.

[29] Charles Allen Prosser, "Answers to Questions Asked by Dr. M. E. Curti of Smith College," [ca. 1933], Typewritten Document, Special Collection, Dunwoody Industrial Institute, Minneapolis, 4.

[30] Prosser, "Practical Arts and Vocational Guidance," 647, 650-51.

[31] Charles Allen Prosser, "Essentials in Vocational Training at Mooseheart," Outline of speech given at the Annual Meeting of the Mooseheart Governors held in Mooseheart, Ill., 17 November 1944, Typewritten Document, Special Collection, Dunwoody Industrial Institute, Minneapolis, 4.

[32] Prosser and Allen, Vocational Education in a Democracy (1925), 138.

[33] Ibid., 212-13.

[34] Ibid., 213-14.

[35] Prosser and Quigley, Vocational Education in a Democracy (1949), 446.

[36] Report of the Commission on National Aid to Vocational Education, 49.

[37] Prosser and Allen, Vocational Education in a Democracy (1925), 223-24.

[38] Report of the Commission on National Aid to Vocational Education, 49.

[39] Prosser and Allen, Vocational Education in a Democracy (1925), 224-28.

[40] Ibid., 227-28.

[41] Ibid., 247-57, 261-62.

[42] Prosser and Allen, Vocational Education in a Democracy (1925), 230-31.

[43] Report of the Commission on National Aid to Vocational Education, 50-51; and Charles Allen Prosser, "Vocational Education Under the Smith-Hughes Act," in Addresses and Proceedings of the Fifty-Sixth Annual Meeting Held in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, June 29-July 6, 1918, vol. LVI, by the National Education Association (Ann Arbor: National Education Association, 1918), 266-67.

[44] Prosser and Quigley, Vocational Education in a Democracy (1949), 334.

[45] Ibid., 37-49.

[46] Ibid., 351-53.

[47] Ibid., 354-56, 527-28.

[48] Prosser and Allen, Vocational Education in a Democracy (1925), 267.

[49] Charles Allen Prosser, A Study of the Boston Mechanic Arts High School (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1915), 33.

[50] Ibid., 204.

[51] William Hood Dunwoody Industrial Institute, "Prospectus: 1915-16," Typewritten Manuscript, Special Collection, John A. Butler Learning Center, Dunwoody Industrial Institute, Minneapolis.

[52] Ibid., 31.

[53] Prosser and Allen, Vocational Education in a Democracy (1925), 200-02.

[54] Dunwoody Institute, "Prospectus:1915-16," 23. The remaining courses were: drafting; applied science; civics; industrial geography; and history.

[55] Ibid., 57.

[56] 1915-16 Dunwoody Institute, "Prospectus:1915-16," 57-59, 64.

[57] Prosser, "Answers to Curti," 8.

[58] See chapter on Philosophy of Education for a discussion of Prosser's learning theory.

[59] Prosser and Allen, Vocational Education in a Democracy (1925), 194-95, 202-03. These are listed as Prosser's first, second, and tenth general theories of vocational education.

[60] Prosser, "Essentials in Vocational Training at Mooseheart," 4.

[61] Prosser and Allen, Vocational Education in a Democracy (1925), 197-98.

[62] Ibid., 199. This is listed as Prosser's sixth theory of vocational education.

[63] See Prosser and Allen, Vocational Education in a Democracy (1925), 283; and Charles Allen Prosser, "Efficient Principles and Practices in Industrial and Trade Education: Memo No. 49," 18 April 1945, Typewritten Document, Special Collection, Dunwoody Industrial Institute, Minneapolis, 10.

[64] Charles Allen Prosser, "Dunwoody's Past, Present and Future", 13 April 1945, Typewritten Document, Special Collection, Dunwoody Industrial Institute, Minneapolis, 15.

[65] Prosser and Allen, Vocational Education in a Democracy (1925), 272-73.

[66] Ibid., 273-74.

[67] John W. Curtis, "The Dunwoody Plan of Continuous Registration of Students," Industrial Education Magazine 5, (November 1931): 133-38.

[68] Prosser and Allen, Vocational Education in a Democracy (1925), 278, 275.

[69] Ibid., 275-76.

[70] See Prosser and Quigley, Vocational Education in a Democracy (1949), 464-466; and Prosser, "Dunwoody's Past, Present and Future," 6, 18.

[71] Prosser and Quigley, Vocational Education in a Democracy (1949), 471-72.

[72] Ibid., 474-76.

[73] Ibid., 476.

[74] Ibid., 478-79.

[75] Ibid., 483-84.

[76] Ibid., 484, 486.

[77] See Prosser, "Dunwoody's Past, Present and Future," 6, 18; and Prosser and Quigley, Vocational Education in a Democracy (1949), 486-93.

[78] John Dewey, Reconstruction in Philosophy (Boston: Beacon Press, 1948; Beacon Paperback edition, 1957), 186.

[79] John Dewey, "Education vs. Trade-Training," The New Republic, 15 May 1915, 42.

[80] Education for a Changing World of Work: Report of the Panel of Consultants on Vocational Education, by Benjamin C. Willis, Chairman (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1963), 224-36.

[81] See earlier section in this chapter entitled, Identifying the Population.

[82] See Dewey, "Education vs. Trade Training," 42; and Owen Reed Lovejoy, "Vocational Guidance and Child Labor'" in Present Status of Drawing and Art in the Elementary and Secondary Schools of the United States, ed. Royal Bailey Farnum (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1914), 13.

[83] Lovejoy, "Vocational Guidance and Child Labor," 15.

[84] Prosser and Allen, Vocational Education in a Democracy (1925), 138.

[85] Prosser, "Answers to Curti," 4.

[86] Ibid., 6.

[87] Dewey, "Education vs. Trade-Training," 42.

[88] John Dale Russell and associates, Vocational Education: Staff Study Number 8 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1938), 126-32.

[89] William G. Camp and John H. Hillison, "Prosser's Sixteen Theorems: A Time for Reconsideration," Journal of Vocational and Technical Education 1 (Fall 1984): 17-18.

CHAPTER IV

CONCEPT OF LIFE ADJUSTMENT AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

Similar to other progressive educators during the first half of the twentieth century, Charles Prosser perceived a need to revamp the educational system to promote democratic principles. This meant education as training for citizenship and social usefulness rather than for individual satisfaction and personal enjoyment. Thus, the purpose of education was the preparation of the individual for life, with the emphasis on benefit to the country as a whole. Instead of the equal opportunity to attend college, students would be provided with the equal opportunity to profit from an education. In order to attain this goal, the general education curriculum as well as instructional methods, were to be infused with the same utilitarianism as that which Prosser promoted regarding vocational education. A strong resemblance between the two programs emerged and lines of distinction became blurred.

Preparation for life, education as preparedness, education for life, and life adjustment education were all synonymous terms and rallying cries for Charles Prosser in his continuing attempt to modify the course of study in the high schools. Prosser's ultimate aim was to instill the general curriculum with his philosophy of vocational

education. How he, and later others, defined this process became an ongoing source of controversy among educators.

Need for the Program

Prosser's convictions regarding the necessity of revising the general secondary course of study were numerous. He provided social, political, economic and educational bases for the program. Nonetheless, he primarily viewed it as a struggle to be won by progressive, forward thinking educators, such as himself, over the conservative, reactionary educator, whose ideas were static and entrenched in out-dated theories. For Prosser, only until the battle was won would the true aims of democracy be reflected in the educational process.

Social, Economic, and Political Demands

In justifying vocational education, Prosser emphasized the economic benefits of the program. However, in education for life adjustment, the social advantages were emphasized, with economic, political, and educational aspects as secondary considerations.

On April 11 and 12, 1946, at a conference sponsored by the United States Office of Education, Prosser expressed many of his concerns about American secondary schools.[1] He believed a new program of secondary education was needed due to social and economic problems. The nation was weakened by economic uncertainty, especially depressions.

People migrated to cities but were ill-equipped for self-support and unfamiliar with societal change. Prosser demonstrated his feelings toward this problem by the following statement:

> The existence of a perpetual and growing class of illiterate refugees and their less literate children such as the Okies and the Arkies who depress the health, morals, and general social and education standards of the communities through which their delapidated [sic] caravans pass.[7]

This migration to the city led to an increased high school enrollment. This growth in high school enrollment was not due to the social benefits of such a program, but resulted from restrictions on adolescent employment. As a whole, these students were generally indifferent towards life and when forced to study college preparatory subjects that they deemed irrelevant, their ennui increased. Even when high schools had the funds to offer life preparation courses, students tended to choose traditional subjects. Prosser stated this was due to the misguided belief that the latter better afforded opportunities for mental training and social standing.

Resultant from the curricular shortcomings of the high schools and absent of individual foresight, students terminated their educations prior to graduation or became truants. Both of these conditions, according to Prosser, caused an increase in criminal activity. Citing statistics for 1945, Prosser claimed the number of delinquents under

the age of twenty-one increased ten fold as compared to the increase in the general population. Prosser concluded, "Crime has become a young man's profession in this country."[3]

Prosser argued that a new educational model was needed in order to maintain political as well as social equilibrium. He claimed that the precedence of the rights and desires of individuals over those of society undermined the nation's political stability. This unrestrained amassing of capital led to actions promoting the equitable distribution of wealth. Monetary surpluses were to be utilized for the gain of society as a whole. While education was to benefit the individual, its ultimate aim was to promote national welfare. It was the responsibility of the schools to advance these precepts. Not to do so placed the country at risk.[4]

In addition to the social, economic, and political advantages of life adjustment education, Prosser viewed it as an educational necessity. As early as 1903, he declared the purpose of education was preparation for total living and sought readjustment of the educational system. Modifications were imperative, for the plan that was in use had been dictated by the university and caused students harm. Prosser cautioned:

> Our educational system has throttled their interests, rejected their needs, dwarfed their intellect, perverted their tastes, crucified

> their talents, blighted their ambition and narrowed the boundaries of their achievement.[5]

Schools needed to be more child-centered and this could occur with life education training. In later years, the *Report of the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education* provided Prosser with an added reason as to why the educational system required alteration.

Life education training was a means of fulfilling the educational objectives set forth in 1918, by the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education of the National Education Association.[6] Prosser considered the high school curriculum that was then currently utilized, as standing in opposition to the proposals made by the Commission. He suggested:

> Perhaps the most convincing way for the reader to measure the comparative value of the traditional high school studies and of the new subject herein proposed would be to check each of them impartially against these Seven Cardinal Principles; health, common knowledge of fundamental processes, worthy home membership, vocation, citizenship, worthy use of leisure time, and ethical character. The results will be disturbing. . . .[7]

Although many vocational educators, and possibly Prosser, were dismayed by the Commission's weak stance concerning vocational education, Prosser found it a useful tool in advocating the acceptance of life adjustment education.[8] Another argument he would employ was the value of life adjustment education in fostering fundamental tenets of democracy.

Democracy in Education

Prosser maintained that a country striving for democracy needed to have a democratic system of education. Although the elementary schools, as a whole, met the criteria of providing a meaningful education to its students, the high schools did not. In essence they practiced educational discrimination by neglecting the needs of the immediate wage earning youth, emphasized cultural education versus citizenship training, and had become bloated institutions solely directing their attentions on the college preparatory student.

According to Prosser, the secondary schools were essentially aristocratic in design. Their focus was on the college bound student with little provision made for the student in need of immediate employment after high school graduation.[9] Too great an emphasis was placed upon education for individual benefit. Prosser stated:

> The schools are not now dealing with subjects in proportion to their importance in a democracy. Present education (high school and college) is largely aimed at personal enjoyment of life. Things that help one to understand and perform the duties of citizenship are the most important things to teach. Whatever helps one to make a living is scarcely less so.[10]

While not entirely disavowing the aspect of education for personal enjoyment, Prosser believed the most critical

function of education to be citizenship training and occupational preparation.

The demands of a democracy were to provide for all citizens a fluid educational system that would meet the varying demands of both the individual and society. In response, the schools provided the contrary. Uniform and static training was given to all at the expense of individual needs and in disregard to changing civic and occupational demands. Prosser explained:

> We assume that the problems with which the individual must deal through life will always be the same. . . . We build up courses of training in the schools out of dead subject-matter and rely on the teaching of facts, while we neglect training in that ability to secure facts and use facts in life situations which is required for even a settled environment and which is absolutely necessary for real efficiency in a constantly changing one.[11]

Prosser viewed the present curriculum as steeped in scholasticism and tradition. For him, a democracy required that citizens be able to think in order to obtain the needed information for solving real life problems. Practical subjects such as civics, home economics, and practical arithmetic had no more value than geometry, Latin, and grammar in providing mental training, thus, the former required emphasis due to their intrinsic interest to the student. Concentrating upon subjects that students determined as having meaning, enhanced learning and promoted the democratic ideal of making education benefit the many rather than the few. As more citizens benefitted

from the educational system, the vertical stratification in society would be replaced by a horizontal structure that was more appropriate with the precepts of a democratic state.

Prosser also contended that democracy required a recognition of differences in intellectual functioning among students. In order to preserve the welfare of the nation, all individuals needed training to maximize the use of their mental abilities. Directing teaching to the average student, which he believed as factually nonexistent, resulted in neglect of those with superior, as well as inferior capabilities.[12]

To Prosser, education was a democratic process in proportion to which it fulfilled the following objectives:

1. It maintains and improves the physical condition of its people.
2. It maintains and improves the quality of the coming generation.
3. It promotes those skills and intelligences which conserve and utilize material resources.
4. It promotes the conservation of human resources.
5. It is universal in its contacts and service.
6. It trains people to think up to the limit of their thinking capacity.
7. It selects and trains capable leaders in all lines of endeavor.
8. It establishes and maintains among people a sane and intelligent view regarding national defense.
9. It trains in the fundamental arts of reading, writing, and figuring up to the necessary minimum which will enable a citizen to communicate with his fellows and to educate himself.

10. It gains these results by efficient procedures and, therefore, at a minimum social cost of time, effort and material.[13]

Not adhering to the above mentioned goals would deny each individual's basic right to meet and intelligently perform the demands of a democracy and fulfill the purpose of education--that of preparation for the responsibilities of life.

Definition of the Program

At various times in his long career in education, Charles Prosser attempted to redefine the course of study in the high school. Throughout the years, although his ideas became somewhat more focused, they essentially remained the same. Simply stated, his plan was that of substituting functional courses for traditional, disciplinary subjects. In his historic `Prosser Resolution', it appeared that Prosser was advocating a life education program only for those students for whom vocational training and preparation for college was inappropriate. Essentially however, he viewed a program of life adjustment as necessary for all students. The guiding principles of such a program were markedly similar to those expressed in relation to vocation education.

Program Guidelines

Prosser detailed much of his plan for secondary education in 1939, in the Inglis lecture presented at

Harvard University. In various formats, he restated these ideas for the remainder of his life. The basic structure of his plan was simply that of mandating that all students spend at least fifty percent of their class time each year involved in studies that were of general interest and utility to all. In actuality, his desire was to have life education courses replace every traditional offering. At the time however, not perceiving this as possible, Prosser suggested that the amount of time spent in these new studies be increased, dependent upon the size of the school.

After students had reached the age of sixteen years, general studies would be replaced by specific subjects directly related to the student's choice of future vocation.[14] Necessarily, akin to vocational education, the initial years of studies were to help students determine a future occupation; therefore, the types of subjects offered were important.

As in vocational training, Prosser argued that since the theory of mental training had been refuted, subjects were to be chosen on the basis "of their superior usefulness for improving the adjustment of youth to life."[15] Specificity in subject content also enhanced the use value of the courses taught. According to Prosser:

> If this democracy, therefore, wants its citizens equipped with the ability to apply any particular body of vital knowledge regarding any matter, then the schools should train them directly in

> getting and using that knowledge. If it wants them to be resourceful in the ability to get facts with which to meet the situations of real life, then the schools must train them directly in the ability to get real facts bearing on real questions. If it wants them to think straight instead of to "jazz" in the affairs of their lives, then the schools must train them, not in absorbing and repeating words, but in the use of efficient procedures in thinking about many different matters and in doing many different things.[16]

Thus, for Prosser, areas of study were to be selected on the basis of their direct application to specific and concrete events as applicable to every student.

Transfer and teaching values were two more factors to be used in determining the merits of specific subjects. Transfer value referred to the degree to which knowledge or reactions gained in one situation could be applied to other situations. Transfer of learning was increased in direct proportion to the similarity between the tasks. Therefore, life preparation courses were at a well-defined advantage over their traditional brethren due to the close relationship between school studies and activities, to those required in life activities.

Teaching value, for Prosser, referred to the extent to which the student assimilated and garnered benefit from the instruction. This was determined in relation to effective: content organization; instructional methods; and teacher methods. In this area life education courses were at a distinct disadvantage to their traditional counterparts.

Inherent in all new subjects, according to Prosser, was the fact that they were not as well developed as those which had been part of the curriculum for centuries. Also, the new subject matter being suggested, was difficult to organize due to its necessary ties to a constantly changing society. Yet these disadvantages would eventually dissipate and were not to preclude the immediate use of life education subjects.[17] Since these new subjects were to apply to a large group of students with varying ability and interest levels, Prosser advised offering a broad range of courses.

The subjects utilized in life adjustment education were to promote habit training through the provision of concrete experiences. Since real life called for the individual to obtain facts and think clearly, these types of habits were to be given priority. Students were to learn through participation rather than by listening and thus habits in skill performance would be attained. Also emphasized were habits which encouraged a sound moral code.

The types of subjects taught would not consist of the standard disciplinary fare of abstract mathematics, foreign languages, or ancient history. Eliminated would be subjects such as plane geometry which, stated Prosser, was useless to ninety-nine percent of the population and was a misguided attempt to train the nonexistent, mental faculty of logical reasoning. In their stead would be subjects

which offered the essentials of reading, writing, and arithmetic along with others which related to the individual's ability to obtain a job, comprehend the environment, raise children and execute responsibilities as citizens.[18]

Instructional Methods

Prosser's guidelines concerning instructional methods were again similar to those that he advocated in vocational training. Books were to be used as reference tools. Class participation through group discussions of life experiences was to be encouraged. The student's ability to apply facts was to determine the amount of learning that had occurred rather than tests of recall. Students were to receive practice in obtaining purposeful information and in the analyzation, organization and interpretation of this information. They were also to gain knowledge as how to develop a plan of action, carry the plan to fruition, evaluate results and determine what modifications needed to be made, if any.[19]

Prosser's plan for secondary education was in reality, that of modeling it after his recommendations for vocational education. To proclaim such would have risked censure from those adamantly opposed to such an idea. Those who advocated life adjustment education saw its application as universal and not just for those entering vocational fields. Nevertheless, in promoting his own

concerns, Prosser did go so far as to propose that the new high school studies be regarded as an apprenticeship to life.

Life Education as Apprenticeship Training

Prosser perceived a correspondence between the indentured apprenticeship and the apprenticeship to life, as both groups were concerned with the fourteen to eighteen year old youth. Just as the indentured apprentice buttressed shop training with school instruction, so too, were the high schools responsible to supplement the student's life experiences with associated instruction.

According to Prosser, course selection for life education training was to be made on the basis of analyzing the end objective of preparation for responsible living, in a manner analogous to how courses were chosen for any occupational apprenticeship.[20] This careful coursework selection was necessary because

> living is a many sided job that everyone must, willy-nilly, perform. Like any other job, its demands on its apprentices are also capable of being analyzed. Only by the study of these demands - as a substitute for tradition, outworn notions, and guesswork - will the secondary school ever secure the functioning subjects and subject matter of greatest help to its students, every one of whom is in a very real sense serving an apprenticeship.[21]

In a parallel vein, the new course of study needed to adhere to the following practices: emphasize personal and performance skills; only offer basic instruction associated

to the task and not beyond that point; school instruction was merely to supplement that which outside experiences did not provide; furnish opportunities to enhance the individual's personal development in areas such as initiative, reliability, pride and getting along with others; whenever possible select subjects that foster concomitant learning as in thinking skills and traits of trustworthiness along with similar areas.[22]

Prosser, in supporting apprenticeship training as life adjustment education, was demonstrating one way vocational programs could take the place of traditional high school studies. Another way was through maintaining controls over the supervision regulations of the program.

Administration

Prosser was aware that the types of programs that he was encouraging had not achieved the approval of most mainstream educators. To offset this he had two suggestions. The first was community involvement. Since schools were meant to be used as agencies of society, they should be controlled by the citizens of that society. Individuals needed to make their own decisions as to how they wanted their schools operated and educational funds appropriated. If they desired that monies be spent on palatial institutions that taught outworn subjects, then so be it. But if instead, they determined that the schools were not providing an appropriate education for their children, then

it was inherent upon them as citizens, to make the necessary changes. Along with asserting their authority over finances, the community was to determine curriculum.

Citizens, according to Prosser, were more qualified than the educators in determining curriculum because the former was more experienced in life. He stated, "The school men know the world of literature and philosophy; the people know the world of reality."[23] A means of ensuring control of the curriculum was through control of the school board.

Prosser ardently maintained that citizens carefully select school board members. This would help guarantee that the desires of the community were fulfilled, rather than individuals meeting their own personal ends or those of educators or politicians. Protection against this possibility was through placing control with a representational lay school board. Prosser believed that only with the involvement of those directly affected by the decisions to be made, would the democratic tradition of a representational government be maintained.[24]

Curriculum

According to his guidelines for life education training, Prosser devised a course of study for high schools to follow. Modeled after vocational education programs, general courses would lead to specific areas of

study with its ultimate aim as creating an economically secure and socially competent citizen.

A Suggested Course of Study

Under the previously mentioned fifty-fifty plan, although the number of required traditional, college preparatory courses would be reduced, subjects would still remain for those students who would attend college. Prosser's remedy for this prescribed that these subjects be chosen on the basis of their mutual advantage to both college-bound and life-bound students.[25] By utilizing the criterion of selecting traditional courses on the basis of highest use value, Prosser came up with the following list, specified in descending order of preference: "Physical science, social studies, classical English, history of other countries, a foreign language, and abstract mathematics."[26] He went on to add that priority was to be given to the first three and proposed substitutes for the others.

Prosser's suggestions for subjects to replace foreign languages, abstract mathematics and the like, were those that afforded students the highest degree of: interest in learning; immediate application of facts to life experiences; awareness of learning for a purpose; and, knowledge gained through performing.[27] All subjects chosen for this new plan of instruction were determined in relation to achievement of the program's primary goal--enhancing the

student's ability to adjust to life. Borrowing task analysis procedures that he utilized in vocational education, Prosser recommended that this dominant goal be divided into the following objectives:

Improving adjustments to the physical world
to family
to social situations
to economic situations
to civic situations

Improving bodily health
mental health and balance
mental resources
ethical resources
intellectual resources[28]

Each of these objectives was then divided into related subject areas and activities. The final step in his analysis pertained to the types of mental responses to be promoted in life adjustment education. These were to include positive and efficient habits of accomplishing tasks such as work, recreational, personal and health habits. Other mental responses to be nurtured were socially desirable attitudes and habits which improved the individual's ability to think, analyze and apply information.[29]

Prosser provided a non-inclusive list of subjects and associated activities, which would fulfill the aforementioned mandates. Similar to his recommendation for vocational educational offerings, these subjects were to be provided in short unit segments, rather than semester

courses as used in traditional programs. Some of Prosser's suggestions were:

ENGLISH

Modern literature for youth: dealing with modern life, appealing to the interests and understanding of youth, and promoting the reading habit.

Practice in the use of English as a tool of communication and expression regarding the affairs of youth and according to commonly employed standards

Practice in business English: letters, forms, reports, etc.

SCIENCE (qualitative only)

The simple science of everyday life
How science safeguards our health and safety
How science increases our comfort
How science promotes our enjoyment of life
How science helps men get their work done
How science increases wealth
Using science in the school shop
Current contributions of science

ECONOMICS

Everybody's business (simple business knowledge for youth)
Simple economics for youth
Economic history of youth in the United States
Economic problems of the local community
Current events in economics

SOCIAL STUDIES

Social history of youth in the United States
Social, economic and family problems of youth
Wholesome recreation in the community
Social amenities and manners
The use of leisure time[30]

Among other subjects that Prosser suggested and deemed important, none were more so than those pertaining to occupational adjustment.

Vocational Training and Life Adjustment Education

Prosser perceived occupational adjustment as a multitude of vocational experiences and activities that would enable the adolescent to become a productive member of society. For this purpose vocational studies were to be integrated into the high school curriculum for students sixteen to eighteen years of age. This group was selected on the premise that youths younger than sixteen were restricted by maturational factors and also by a paucity of employment opportunities. Prior to the age of sixteen, students were to be offered prevocational courses which were to provide exploratory work in the practical arts.[31] Occupational adjustment was to consist of two main components--vocational advisement and vocational education.

Prosser repeatedly declared that all students not preparing for college should be offered vocational advisement as a means of equipping them to successfully confront life's demands. He defined the subject area of advisement as an ordered plan for providing youths with practical training that offered aid in selecting an appropriate occupation and the methods of securing employment. Thus, its primary goal was social rather than academic. Secondary schools were chosen by Prosser to dispense these ideas due to the school's customary role in society as custodial institutions.[32]

In selecting a job, Prosser delineated the following objectives in which the student required practice:

> Learning how to get facts about occupations and how to interpret and use them; learning the mental, physical, educational and personality requirements for success in an occupation; learning about your own mental, physical, educational and personality assets; checking them against the corresponding demands of any occupation studied; learning and practicing ways of improving yourself in order to increase your assets; and determining what occupations you like for which you are fitted.[33]

Obtaining a job demanded exercises taking the student through all of the steps involved in the employment process. These were to include locating employment opportunities, contacting potential employers, completing an application form, and conducting a successful interview.[34]

Prosser's plan regarding vocational advisement as part of the general secondary curriculum, was essentially the same proposal he made for students of vocational education programs. A comparable correspondence was displayed in his recommendations concerning specific vocational education subjects as part of life adjustment education.

Prosser stated that vocational training was a necessary and high-ranking part of the curriculum because it advanced desirable habits which enhanced the student's adaptation to future social and economic contingencies.[35] This occurred

> because of the wide spread of the all-round experiences used in training, there is a corresponding wide spread of concomitant learnings in habits which carry over or transfer

> directly to the occupation. Because of the repetitive, controlled experiences used in the training there is more time to control the teaching, practice, improved use, and retention of these products of good teaching.[36]

Other reasons for including vocational training as a part of life adjustment education were that intellectual abilities, to some extent, increased as a result of stimulating and challenging activities. Also, students with poor academic records in traditional subject areas demonstrated large improvement when involved in vocational training.[37] Thus, to Prosser, vocational education not only meant skill training, but intellectual and attitudinal uplifting.

In the new curriculum, students were to spend their first two years concentrating on subjects of widespread utility for life, while the balance of studies were to be geared towards specific occupational training. Prosser maintained this idea as sound because it was similar to that of universities where students initially studied general courses while later taking only those subjects directly related to a future occupational goal such as law or medicine.[38]

Vocational courses specific to life-adjustment education were never enumerated by Prosser, most likely as he viewed this as unnecessary. Since they were to relate to a definite occupation, the courses could be organized by vocational educators and taught utilizing the same

principles he advocated for those enrolled in vocational programs.[39]

In truth, Prosser's entire curriculum for life adjustment education was but a restatement of those ideas he promoted regarding vocational education. The early years of high school were intended to determine later occupational studies which, in vocational programs, was termed prevocational training. Just as in vocational programs, advisement and training followed this early discovery period, the same was true in life adjustment education. The similarity between the two areas of study continued, as witnessed by Prosser's views toward teaching personnel.

Essentials in Teaching

An integral part of life preparation education was the teaching force. New subject areas required new teaching prerequisites. Also needed were new ideas concerning the definition of teaching.

Prosser supported three basic ideas concerning teacher qualifications. The first was that the teaching force become more experientially and less academically oriented. He believed that teachers directly out of college merely possessed a fund of knowledge in some disciplinary area. They lacked a first hand knowledge of life which was essential in order to teach life education subjects. This could be remedied through an additional college requirement. After individuals earned their Bachelor's Degree and

prior to the onset of teaching, they were to obtain self-supporting employment. Thus, teachers would gain by actually experiencing those things in life that their students would need to learn.

Another prerequisite for the teacher was knowledge of the principles underlying habit psychology for, according to Prosser, these varied greatly from the ideas that governed traditional, disciplinary studies. The teacher also needed to gain a working knowledge of the ideas of people such as John Dewey and Edward Thorndike, which would afford reasons as to why life education subjects were superior to their disciplinary counterparts. Prosser believed, once teachers of new subjects became aware of the truths involved in these ideas, they would no longer be intimidated by those supporting the presumed supremacy of college preparatory courses.

The third requirement of teachers was that they possess the ability to create a task analysis of the subject area as it related to life's demands. This would result in the teacher's decreased dependance on textbooks. Students would benefit by being provided with only that information necessary to ensure adjustment to their environment.[40]

Not only did Prosser outline qualifications for teachers of life adjustment studies, but he expressed specific views as to exigencies for competent teaching.

Fulfilling the previously mentioned prerequisites was a good beginning for those wishing to teach life education subjects; however, of prime importance was their ability to convey ideas in the manner Prosser ordained as correct.

The strength of a democracy, in Prosser's view, rested upon the ability to obtain intelligent leaders and citizens. This would only take place through the employment of perceptive teachers. Undesirable leaders and misguided followers were the result of unsound teaching. Prosser took care to differentiate between instructors and teachers.

Persons who solely conveyed research ideas were instructors. Teachers were those who attempted to influence attitudes and perceptions by interpreting ideas and thus, providing individuals with new insights. From teaching, learners gained little new information however, their insight on the topic improved.[41] Although new ideas and facts were important, their value to society was related to the person's ability to understand and use the information which, Prosser believed, rested on true teaching:

> Research discovers facts and ideas; instruction spreads them; but real teaching trains citizens to use them resourcefully in the performance of the citizenship job. The first provides new material for work; the second, informs citizens of its existence; but the third equips them to select and apply it when they need it. If this be true, then real teaching prepares citizens for following leadership intelligently and leaders to discharge the duties of leadership effectively.[42]

Prosser deemed instruction used alone as poor teaching with the end result being the student's memorization and repetition of facts. Good teaching on the other hand, resulted in interesting and active learning where the student learned to interpret and understand information.

Prosser's ideas concerning the teacher's role in life preparation education as well as concomitant curricular modifications were realized in the Life Adjustment Movement. His historic pronouncement concerning the shortcomings of high schools served as a nation-wide rallying cry for many educators and federal officials.

Life Adjustment Movement

Concerns that the schools were not meeting the needs of all youths were not those of Charles Prosser alone. During the period following World War I and throughout the 1940s, the most discernible pedagogical theme in America was the attempt to inject functionalism into the high school curriculum. Gaining momentum from the publication of the *Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education*, in 1918, progressive educators sought relief from traditional, college dominated studies. Various educational plans were implemented depending on whose interpretation of utilitarianism was accepted at the time.

Emerging at the tail-end of educational progressivism was an emphasis on education as social utility which resulted in a demand for life preparation training.

Consequently, a portal was opened, as never before, for progressive educators and those in vocational education to unite for a common purpose. It was at this juncture that Prosser expressed his views concerning secondary education. Known as the `Prosser Resolution', the Life Adjustment Movement was officially inaugurated, in 1945, as one of the many strands of progressive education. It would become the last.

Federal Involvement

Prosser's views on secondary education gained national notoriety in 1945. A two day conference was scheduled, sponsored by the Division of Vocational Education of the Office of Education. Concerns were raised regarding the persistent deficiencies existing within secondary education in meeting the needs of all youths. In attendance was Charles Prosser, who was asked to encapsulate the opinions of those present. He stated:

> It is the belief of this conference that, with the aid of this report in final form, the vocational school of a community will be able better to prepare 20 percent of the youth of secondary school age for entrance upon desirable skilled occupations; and that the high school will continue to prepare another 20 percent for entrance to college. We do not believe that the remaining 60 percent of our youth of secondary school age will receive the life adjustment training they need and to which they are entitled as American citizens--unless and until the administrators of public education with the assistance of the vocational education leaders formulate a similar program for this group.
>
> We therefore request the United States Commissioner of Education and the Assistant

> Commissioner for Vocational Education to call at some early date a conference or a series of regional conferences between an equal number of representatives of general and of vocational education--to consider this problem and to take such initial steps as may be found advisable for its solution.[43]

Through this resolution, Prosser acquired an avenue for widespread support of his convictions regarding secondary education. Realizing the day was past where vocational educators alone could hope to wield influence upon the general high school curriculum, he sought an alliance between the two groups. Most likely, Prosser's intention was that through the cooperation of general and vocational educators, the former would acquiesce to the principles that he advocated.

Receiving unqualified support from John W. Studebaker, United States Commissioner of Education, five regional conferences were convened during 1946, to consider the implications of the `Prosser Resolution'. In attendance were principals of secondary schools, state administrators in vocational education, school superintendents, administrators and professors of teacher training schools, state department of education staff members, officers of professional organizations and directors from the areas of curriculum and research. Addressing at least one of these conferences was Charles Prosser who offered the social, economic and educational reasons which necessitated life adjustment training.[44]

The following year Prosser, in collaboration with a committee from the Office of Education and in preparation for the national conference, reworded his noted resolution:

> It is the belief of this conference that, with the aid of this report in final form, schools will be able better to prepare for entrance upon desirable skilled occupations those youth who by interest and aptitude can profit from such training. We believe that the high school will continue to improve its offerings for those youth who are preparing to enter college. In the United States the people have adopted the ideal of secondary education for all youth. As this ideal is approached, the high school is called upon to serve an increasing number of youth for whom college preparation or training for skilled occupations is neither feasible nor appropriate. The practical problems connected with the provision of a suitable educational program for this increasing number are so great and the schools to date have had, comparatively, so little experience in this enterprise that the problem merits cooperative study and action by leaders in all aspects of secondary education. We believe that secondary school administrators and teachers and vocational education leaders should work together to the end that the number of attempts being made in secondary schools to meet this need will be greatly increased and to the end that the pronouncements made in recent years by various educational groups which are suggestive of needed curriculum patterns will receive increased study and implementation.[45]

In this new wording, eliminated were references to percentages of students receiving vocational, college preparatory, or in need of life adjustment training. Eliminated, too, was any implication of blame for the shortcomings of secondary education. Strengthened was the position of cooperation between the various groups of educators serving the adolescent population.

At the National Conference on Life Adjustment Education, held May, 1947, conferees were divided into subcommittees to develop specific and pragmatic action plans regarding various curricular, administrative, and organizational concerns. The committees were overwhelmingly successful in their assigned tasks as witnessed by Prosser's dramatic closing remarks:

> Never in all the history of education has there been such a meeting as this one in which you have participated so loyally, so faithfully, and with such great productivity. Never was there such a meeting where people were so sincere in their belief that this was the golden opportunity to do something that would give to *all* American youth their educational heritage so long denied. What you have planned is worth fighting for--it is worth dying for.[46]

Among other organizational considerations, recommendations were made to the Office of Education requesting that a commission on life adjustment education for youth be established with members to serve a three year term. Its purpose was to encourage life adjustment education for all youth in grades seven to fourteen. Commissioner Studebaker complied.[47]

Thus rested the totality of federal involvement towards life adjustment training. Implementation of programs and associated funding were to be encouraged at the state and local level. However, the United States Office of Education served as a prestigious body advocating and supporting the state's implementation of such programs.

Although Prosser's formal involvement in life adjustment education ceased at the conclusion of the first National Conference, the ideas he championed continued to gain an audience. The Prosser Resolution not only summarized the ideas of those attending a conference, but provided a banner to wave for all of those hoping to instill social objectives into secondary education.

Implementation of Ideas

There would be two commissions on life adjustment education. The first commission was established in 1947, with the designated educational goal as "designed to equip all American youth to live democratically with satisfaction to themselves and profit to society as home members, workers and citizens."[48] Established were seven guiding precepts for life adjustment programs, all of which Prosser would have wholeheartedly agreed: (1) recognition was to be given to differences between individuals as to abilities and personality; (2) secondary schools were to be functional for students not preparing for college or an occupation; (3) courses were to be chosen on the basis of their application to solving life problems; (4) practical experiences would be of predominant importance in teaching; (5) active participation and cooperation would be sought between educators, students, and community and business members; (6) teachers were to be instructed as how to utilize records and test data as a means of measuring their

own performance as well as benefitting students; and (7) a student's progress would be evaluated in relation to advancement in attitudes, abilities and habits.[49]

In addition to defining the goals and objectives of life adjustment education, the Commission sponsored area conferences and encouraged local and state support of their efforts. The result was the implementation of numerous teacher training workshops as well as experimental programs in public and private secondary schools. These promotional activities would be continued by the Second Commission.

The report issued by the Second Commission on Life Adjustment Education for Youth summarized the state developments in life adjustment education during the years from 1950 to 1953. A total of twenty nine states were reported as effecting definite studies or programs related to the Commission's goals in education. The results of these action were witnessed in the high schools by: the evolution of the comprehensive high school; a decreasing tendency to provide separate curricula for college preparation and vocational training; the use of large unit instruction, audiovisual aids and cooperative planning between teachers and students; the increasing focus on student growth and development; employment of tests to assess skill acquisition, attitudes and interests; the encouragement of a more democratic atmosphere in schools through student government and policy decisions made by

staff consensus; and a broadening relationship between the school and community.[50] Although the Commission concluded their report with a call for further exploration into life adjustment education, a third commission was never appointed.

The Commission's successful role as a propagandizing agent along with the popularly accepted suggestions in the 1944 publication, *Education for All American Youth*, resulted in the establishment of life adjustment training programs in many of the nation's high schools.[51] The key to all new courses was the integration of studies with the learner's life needs. Traditional courses such as English, science, and mathematics were to be restructured in keeping with their new functional purpose. In addition, courses such as family life education with associated topics of dating, selecting a mate, child-rearing, and the development of values, were to be integrated into other curricular areas.[52]

The concept of life adjustment training and related modifications in the high school curriculum were generally in keeping with the principles advocated by Charles Prosser. Just as the *Smith-Hughes Act* brought to fruition his ideas concerning vocational education, the same can be said of life adjustment education and secondary education. However, life adjustment education, by mere virtue of its connection to adapting students to society while still

attempting to meet their individual needs, was difficult to define and even more difficult to implement.

The demise of life adjustment education was symptomatic of America's disenchantment with progressive education at large.[53] Although not dissimilar to other earlier proposed curricular changes, its massive popularity made it an easily identifiable target for opponents.

Critics

Many of Charles Prosser's ideas concerning secondary education were realized in life adjustment training; however, it was a program not only advocated by him, but by other progressive educators as well. Condemnation of the ideas that he promoted were not directed specifically at him, but at everyone who supported such so-called educational travesties. Criticisms of the program centered around anti-intellectualism and subversion of American educational ideals.

A common criticism of life adjustment training was over-expansion of the school's responsibilities to students. This concern was raised by Mortimer Smith in *And Madly Teach*. He suggested that acceptance of the assumption of education as life, implied that the school duplicate the student's environment and thus shoulder tasks formerly assigned to parents and institutions other than the schools. The result of this action was a curriculum comprised of a conglomeration of common-sense subjects.

Smith maintained that if educators truly desired a duplication of the young person's environment, they should rethink their priorities. Rather than learning based on interest and ability levels, an idea promoted by Prosser, emphasis was to be placed on the compulsory aspects of life.[54] Expounding on this concern was Robert Hutchins in *The Conflict in Education*.

Decried in life adjustment education was the trivialization of the curriculum. According to Hutchins, this occurred as a result of the progressive educator's adherence to inappropriate doctrines. The theory of adjustment suggested that the individual was to be adapted to the environment--an impossible task as society was in a constant state of flux. Resultant was the student's accumulation of a large body of soon-to-be, non-functioning facts. Similarly, attempts at teaching vocational subjects, resulted in skills that became obsolescent even before being utilized.

Another theory, named by Hutchins, that led to curricular erosion was that of meeting the individual's and society's immediate needs. The multiplicity of such needs necessarily concluded in a course of study so broad that it was impossible for the student to master any specific subject area.[55]

A formidable critic of progressive education in general and particularly life adjustment training was the

historian, Arthur E. Bestor. His objections centered around educational theory and its interpretation into practice.

Whereas Prosser believed the purpose of education as training for citizenship and social usefulness, Bestor forcefully declared that its purpose was intellectual training. Thus, a dichotomy existed between these two views which Bestor expressed as:

> The issue is drawn between those who believe that good teaching should be directed to sound intellectual ends, and those who are content to dethrone intellectual values and cultivate the techniques of teaching for their own sake, in an intellectual vacuum.[56]

He maintained that this aura of anti-intellectualism caused a de-emphasis on studies in mathematics and foreign languages at a time when the nation could least afford to do so. National security was dependent on scientific theory and therefore, mathematical skills were in desperate need. Also, post war, international tensions demanded that citizens be fluent in more than one language. Perpetrating these educational perversions was life education training.

According to Bestor, the new educational model, through its deficiencies in intellectual training, promoted the concept of a subservient citizenry.[57] Although self-reliance inevitably was encouraged through a liberal education by virtue of its emphasis on intellectual training, vocational education and life adjustment training on the other hand "generates in the student the belief that

he cannot deal with any matter until he has taken a course in it."[58] The effect was the loss of creativity and originality at a time when societal problems demanded the greatest development of these processes.

In a direct attack on the `Prosser Resolution', Bestor concluded that an inherent shortcoming of the life education program was the assumption that sixty percent of the student population was incapable of benefitting from intellectual training. Thus, individuals accepting this proposition were destined to be employed in menial occupations that served the superior few.

Bestor's continued contempt for the vocational education aspect of life education was evidenced in his critique of progressive education theories. He conceded that liberal education and vocational training could harmoniously co-exist but only if the latter did not interfere with the basic task of schools to advance intellectual training. Life adjustment education proved this to be an impossible goal.[59] This unwillingness to compromise became one of three major factors leading to the total collapse of the program. Each of these was detailed by Patricia Graham in her succinct history of the Progressive Education Association.

The first was described as rigidity of thought. Progressive educators were guilty of misunderstanding their critics in thinking that they wanted a return to the narrow

curriculum utilized in the early twentieth century. In reality, many of the naysayers merely wanted compromise from extremist interpretations of the new educational philosophy. Rather than yield, progressive educators simply attempted to meet the student's short-term needs by suggesting that history courses be replaced by those such as marriage and the family, thus further distancing the two groups.[60]

A second weakness in life adjustment training was its lack of clearly defined goals and objectives. Graham described this as the progressive educators' eagerness to discard traditional subjects coupled with their inability to delineate exactly what the new curriculum was to include. As a result, teachers were faced with the task of teaching ill-defined subject areas. Compounding this problem was the insistence that they also employ unfamiliar teaching methods.[61] Whereas Prosser believed vagueness as inherent in any new subject areas and that this would disappear with time, in reality it resulted in rejection of the program.

A final criticism of progressive education, one that likely sealed the decision on its impending doom, was its lack of social insight. Proponents ignored many societal concerns such as those dealing with educating immigrant and poverty level children. Desegregation matters were also overlooked. All of these issues were in evidence by the

late 1940s and early 1950s, but progressive educators, professing to deal with the problems of youth, chose not to consider them.[62] Similarly inclined was Charles Prosser. His concern over the increasing number of illiterate refugees and their children was expressed in terms of their effect in depressing society's moral, health and educational standards. He viewed life adjustment training not necessarily as a means of aiding these individuals, but as a way of protecting society.[63]

Conclusion

Prosser's ideas concerning secondary education and, thus, life adjustment training, were extreme interpretations of social utility wedded to educational purpose. Although initially he proposed this new educational model only comprise fifty percent of the high school curriculum, in truth, he desired that it totally replace traditional courses and teaching methods. Just as vocational education was to be rid of contaminating influences from traditional, college preparatory subjects, so too was life preparation training. The public's quick acceptance and rejection of the program was merely characteristic of society's own confusion as to educational purpose. The vociferousness of the attacks against ideas advocated by Prosser led to a return to traditional methodologies within secondary education. Nonetheless,

when the uproar quieted, his legacy to education was revealed.

CHAPTER FOUR NOTES

[1] Charles Allen Prosser, "The Adjustment of Youth to Life," Statement given at a conference held under the auspices of the U. S. Office of Education, New York, 12-12 April, Typewritten Document, Special Collection, Dunwoody Industrial Institute, Minneapolis, 1-3.

[2] Ibid., 1.

[3] Ibid., 2.

[4] Charles Allen Prosser, "Education as Preparedness," School and Society 3, (June 1916): 797-804.

[5] Charles Allen Prosser, "Needed Re-Adjustment of Our School System," Educator Journal 3 (February 1903): 242.

[6] Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education: A Report of the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education, by Clarence D. Kingsley, Chairman (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1918).

[7] Charles Allen Prosser, Secondary Education and Life, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1939), 59. The same statement can also be found in: Prosser, "The Adjustment of Youth to Life," 6.

[8] See Chapter II for a discussion of the Cardinal Principles of Education.

[9] Charles Allen Prosser and Charles R. Allen, Have We Kept the Faith? America at the Crossroads in Education (New York: Century Co., 1929), 68, viii.

[10] Ibid., xii.

[11] Ibid., 99.

[12] Ibid., 108-09, 88, 102-03.

[13] Ibid., 389.

[14] Charles Allen Prosser, Secondary Education and Life (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1939), 3-4, 64-65.

[15] Ibid., 7.

[16] Ibid., 21-22.

[17] Ibid., 10-12, 23-25.

[18] Prosser and Allen, Have We Kept the Faith?, 424, 27, 424-25.

[19] Prosser, Secondary Education and Life, 61-62.

[20] See Ibid., 36-37; and Prosser, "The Adjustment of Youth to Life," 3-5.

[21] Prosser, Secondary Education and Life, 37-38.

[22] Ibid., 39-46.

[23] Prosser, "Needed Re-Adjustment of Our School System," 246.

[24] See Prosser and Allen, Have We Kept the Faith?, 27; and Charles Allen Prosser and Thomas H. Quigley, Vocational Education in a Democracy (Chicago: American Technical Society, 1949), 530-31.

[25] Prosser, Secondary Education and Life, 34.

[26] Ibid., 35.

[27] Charles Allen Prosser, "Vocational Education as Life Adjustment," Presentation given to the Wisconsin Educational Association, 1936 or 1937), Typewritten Document, Special Collection, Dunwoody Industrial Institute, Minneapolis, 10.

[28] Prosser, Secondary Education and Life, 51.

[29] Ibid., 51-56.

[30] Ibid., 46-49. Additional subjects that Prosser recommended and detailed in the aforementioned pages were: civics, mathematics, arts, and vocational training.

[31] Charles Allen Prosser, "The Future of Occupational Adjustment," Speech given at the National Occupational Conference, Minneapolis, 19 May 1939, Typewritten Document, Special Collection, Dunwoody Industrial Institute, Minneapolis, 4, 2. This speech, by the same title, was included in a collection of essays by Prosser, The Vocational Advisement of Youth (Fort Collins, Colorado: Colorado A. and M. College, 1945). Subsequent notes will refer to the original source of the material.

[32] See Prosser, "The Future of Occupational Adjustment," 2-4; and Charles Allen Prosser, "Vocational Guidance in Smaller Communities," Address made to Kiwanis Society, Minneapolis, 28 January 1938, Typewritten Document, Special Collection, Dunwoody Industrial Institute, Minneapolis, 12. The latter was included in a collection of essays by Prosser, "What Vocational Advisement for Youth," in The Vocational Advisement of Youth. Subsequent notes will refer to the original source of the material.

[33] Prosser, "The Future of Occupational Adjustment," 6.

[34] Prosser, "Vocational Guidance in Smaller Communities," 11.

[35] Prosser, Secondary Education and Life, 70-71.

[36] Ibid., 75.

[37] Ibid., 73.

[38] Ibid., 65.

[39] See Chapter III for details concerning vocational training courses.

[40] Charles Allen Prosser, "What Type of Teacher does the Youth of 14 - 21 Years Need?", Note cards of speech given at Men's Union, [Minneapolis, 20 November 1939, Typewritten Document, Special Collection, Dunwoody Industrial Institute, Minneapolis, 2-9.

[41] Prosser, Have We Kept the Faith?, 272, 281, 269.

[42] Ibid., 273.

[43] See United States Office of Education, Life Adjustment Education for Every Youth, (Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office, [1948]), 15; and Prosser, "The Adjustment of Youth to Life," 9.

[44] See United States Office of Education, Life Adjustment Education for Every Youth, 16; and Prosser, "The Adjustment of Youth to Life," 1-8.

[45] United States Office of Education, Life Adjustment Education for Every Youth, 18-19.

[46] Ibid., 22.

[47] Ibid., 40-41.

[48] United States Office of Education, Developing Life Adjustment Education in a Local School (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1949), 3, quoted in United States Office of Education, Vitalizing Secondary Education: Report of the First Commission on Life Adjustment Education for Youth (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1951), 1.

[49] Ibid., 38-39.

[50] United States Office of Education, A Look Ahead in Secondary Education: Report of the Second Commission on Life Adjustment Education for Youth (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1951), 10, 77-84.

[51] Education Policies Commission, Education for All American Youth, (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association and American Association of School Administrators, 1944). A brief overview of this publication can be found in Chapter I.

[52] Lester A. Kirkendall, "Education for Marriage and Family Living," in Life Adjustment Education in Action: A Symposium, ed. Franklin R. Zeran (New York: Chartwell House, Inc., 1953), 103-13. Excellent sources on suggestions for life adjustment education can be found in Zeran and also in Harl R. Douglass, ed., Education for Life Adjustment: Its Meaning and Implementation (New York: Ronald Press, 1950).

[53] Lawrence A. Cremin, The Transformation of the School: Progressivism in American Education 1876-1957 (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1961; Vintage Books, 1964), 338.

[54] Mortimer Smith, And Madly Teach (Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1949), 27-28, 40-41.

[55] Robert M. Hutchins, The Conflict in Education in a Democratic Society (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1953), 14-18, 34-36.

[56] Arthur E. Bestor, Educational Wastelands (Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1953), 11.

[57] Ibid., 58-59, 63-64.

[58] Ibid., 63.

[59] Ibid., 82-83, 81.

[60] Patricia Albjerg Graham, Progressive Education: From Arcady to Academe (New York: Teachers College Press, 1967), 150-51.

[61] Ibid., 149-50, 160-61.

[62] Ibid., 153-54.

[63] Prosser, "The Adjustment of Youth to Life," 1.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This research study has explored Charles Allen Prosser's views of secondary education as represented in his publications, speeches, and unpublished documents. An attempt has been made to discern Prosser's philosophy of secondary education, the development of his ideas, and the consistency to which his theories were applied to curriculum and instruction.

In Chapter I it was indicated that the economic, social, and political problems associated with industrialization, occurring within the late nineteenth century, provided the setting for the general reform movement in the United States. Prosser, the son of a factory worker, grew up during this period and as a result developed a concern for the problems of the working man. Knowledge and skills that would prove invaluable to him later in life were developed while still a college student. His oratory skills and legal background served to make Prosser an impressive force in the delineation and passage of legislation for vocational education. His college studies also exposed him to an analysis of democracy as well as to the ideas of John Dewey, Edward Thorndike, and David Snedden. All influenced the development of his philosophy of secondary education.

Prosser's association with Snedden proved fateful. It not only gave Prosser insight into the relationship of the school to society, but also afforded him the start of a life-long career in vocational education. With no prior working experience in the field of vocational education, Prosser assumed the prestigious position of Deputy Commissioner of Industrial Education for the State of Massachusetts. This fact is of note in that his appointment stood in opposition to Prosser's strongly held future contention that vocational educators be chosen predominately on the basis of their successful experiences in related work areas.

Early in his career Prosser established himself as a tireless, yet dogmatic advocate of legislation for his conception of vocational education. The passage of the *Smith-Hughes Act* in 1917, a definitive law primarily written by Prosser, established the course of vocational education for the next forty-six years. In this law, Prosser ensured that school program funding was tied to specific vocational areas and contingent upon approval by a separate administrative board, not associated with that of general education. The result of this dual administrative policy was to insure the integrity of vocational education programs as conceptualized by Prosser. Yet, this same policy also resulted in widening the schism between

vocational and general education--a division still in existence today.

Prosser's work in general education, although short-lived, actually preceded that of vocational education. Prior to his doctoral studies and association with David Snedden, Prosser served as a school superintendent in Indiana. Not long after this appointment he was chosen President of the Indiana State Teacher's Association. It was in his address to this group that his ideas concerning general education reform were revealed. These early ideas were ones that he continuously advocated throughout his entire life.

Basically, Prosser argued that the university should no longer dictate the secondary education curriculum. The purpose of an education was not just to prepare a few students for college, but to afford every individual life preparation training. Achievement of this goal meant replacing traditional, disciplinary subjects with those of more practical value. Prosser carried this theme of education as preparation for life into the field of vocational education.

Prosser's early dedication to general education reform never diminished. During his long and distinguished tenure as director of a private vocational school and as a leading spokesman for vocational education, Prosser continued to address the issue of instilling utilitarian aims into the

general high school curriculum. These ideas emerged coincidental to the final period of activity of progressive education reform and culminated in the Life Adjustment Movement.

Early milestones in Prosser's life helped to shape his philosophy of education. Later events served as forums for him to practice and espouse these views. Prosser's philosophy of secondary education, delineated in Chapter II, was essentially a fusion of ideas emerging from several sources.

Prosser's interpretation of the democratic ideals of America's founding fathers resulted in his belief that egalitarianism was achieved through meeting the educational needs of all citizens. America's educational system was unique to the country's specific needs and should not imitate European, aristocratic procedures. Education was to result in a trained citizenry where all individuals were endowed with skills that benefitted both society and the individual.

John Dewey's ideas were also factors in Prosser's educational philosophy. Although many of their views were at odds--due to Prosser's misinterpretation or selective adoption of ideas--Prosser specified Dewey as an educational ally. Through Dewey, Prosser viewed the school and society as integrally related. Striking similarities in thought and wording are found between passages written by

Dewey in 1899, and that written by Prosser thirty years later.

Analogous to Dewey, Prosser believed the schools were to benefit society, and that all individuals had similar needs which education was to address. However, unlike Dewey, Prosser did not see the schools as tools of social reform. Education was to provide life preparation training through the provision of vocational training with the intent of acquiring specific occupational skills. These ideas were anathema to Dewey, although not addressed by Prosser when discussing Dewey's ideas.

Significant in the development of Prosser's theories of education were scientific principles of learning as developed by educational psychologists of that day. Their research provided Prosser with what he took to be concrete evidence as to the worthlessness of disciplinary studies, the limitations of transfer of training, and the merit of task-specific learning. Prosser's ideas concerning the selection of subjects based on their use, content, and teaching values resulted from his exposure to these scientific precepts. Also to adhere to these same principles was David Snedden to whom Prosser attributed his social philosophy and views involving vocational education.

Snedden's contribution to Prosser's educational philosophy was in the delineation of educational purpose in terms of social efficiency. Societal welfare was promoted

through the conservation of natural and human resources. The importance of vocational education as a tool in achieving this goal, as well as program delineations, were also ideas Prosser obtained from his association with Snedden. However, differences existed in their educational philosophies. Whereas Snedden viewed the school as a tool for social control, Prosser considered it instead as a means for social service. Concomitantly, Snedden's belief in educational predestination led him to the opinion that the school take a strong approach in directing students to their correct educational program. Prosser, having no such belief, maintained individuals were guided to an appropriate program through educational explorations of their interests, desires, and needs.

The *Report of the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education* added to Prosser's educational theory in that it offered a model for integrating vocational training into the high school curriculum. Prosser agreed with the Commission's contention that the purpose of an education was to benefit both society and the individual. Social efficiency was achieved through service to society. Both Prosser and the Commission recognized the value of utilitarian courses as comprising the curriculum. Prosser strongly objected to the inclusion of `leisure' as one of the seven curricular objectives of secondary education. This fact notwithstanding, the Commission's delineation of

seven cardinal principles of education, in all likelihood, served as Prosser's guide in his development of a plan to integrate general and vocational education.

The educational philosophy that Prosser developed emphasized utilitarian, universal education as a means of attaining an intelligent citizenship, which would function to benefit society. Life preparation training, utilizing scientific learning theories, equipped individuals to efficiently serve society. Vocational training prepared the individual for societal demands and, thus, was an integral part of any educational program.

Prosser's philosophy of secondary education was comprehensive and clearly defined. The tenets of this philosophy were used by him in developing vocational and general education programs as was indicated in Chapters III and IV.

Vocational training--whether offered by itself or in life preparation programs--was the path that Prosser discerned as fulfilling his educational purposes. Vocational education was warranted to efficiently utilize and conserve the nation's natural resources as well as maximize labor utilization and supply. Efficient and dynamic vocational training programs would ensure the nation's economic growth through: deterring labor waste; increasing the labor force; offsetting the rise in cost of living; increasing the number of fully trained individuals; and decreasing the

unemployment ranks. These advantages were also mentioned in respect to Prosser's advocacy of life adjustment education, but down-played in favor of the social benefits of that program.

The social benefits of vocational training were to offset a variety of social ills such as civil unrest and criminal activity. Vocational education would also afford society a greater return on monies expended on education by providing a program that would profit all, rather than the few who would later attend college.

The individual profited from vocational training through increased earning potential and improved value system. Transfer of learning was enhanced through vocational education as it was related to interest levels. Prosser concluded, somewhat erroneously, that the greatest interest levels of most individuals were related to matters of income. This conclusion was made without factual substantiation and ignored need-factors as determinants of interest.

Prosser's plan for vocational education was one that he advocated his entire life, enacted during his tenure at the Dunwoody Institute, and carried over into general education. Students were selected on the basis of their interests, needs, and ability levels with prevocational training serving the purpose of vocational guidance. This was an important aspect of his plan as such programs were

not to result in repositories for intellectually limited students. An idea inherent in all types of vocational training advocated by Prosser, was that it not be tainted by the corrupting influences of general education. This resulted in not only a separate administrative policy, but in distinct plans regarding curriculum, instructional methods, and teacher training.

The curriculum was structured so that traditional, classical subjects were replaced by practical courses directly related to specific vocational areas. Fifty percent of the student's time was scheduled for these studies with the balance devoted to actual occupational training. Training was deemed best when it occurred in the natural working environment or in a setting that closely simulated such a setting. Instructional methods duplicated the work place so as to assure the student's marketability of skills. The teacher training program recommended by Prosser emphasized expertise within the occupational area over mastery of pedagogical technique--a policy which became subject to criticism.

Parallels are seen when comparing Prosser's ideas regarding vocational programs with those concerning the general high school program. Both enabled him to realize his view of education as social service through vocational training. The purpose of both was training for the preparation for life. Life adjustment education served to

provide a comprehensive plan that consolidated vocational and general secondary education programs.

In life adjustment education, during the first two years of study, at least fifty percent of all student's class days were devoted to common interest, functional, life preparation studies. Vocational training comprised the last two years of high school studies for those students not preparing for college.

The purpose of these common studies was to inculcate socially desirable habits and served as prevocational training through an exploration of students' specific interests and capabilities. Traditional subjects remained for those students preparing for college, however, the most abstract of these were eliminated. Subject preference was determined by the community, as they were more experienced in life than was the educator. Thus, as true in vocational education, those individuals possessing practical experience were believed the prime determiners of curriculum. Similarly, life experience was a major factor in teacher selection.

Prosser's association with the Life Adjustment Movement was primarily in summarizing the opinions of vocational educators concerned with perceived deficiencies in secondary education. His words proved inspirational and served to unite vocational educators, general educators, and the public.

Prosser stated that high schools successfully met the needs of those students enrolled in vocational and college preparatory programs. Nonetheless, these same schools were neglectful in fulfilling the life adjustment needs of sixty percent of the student population. At Prosser's request the United States Commissioner of Education convened national conferences with the purpose of developing life adjustment programs.

Although Prosser's active involvement in revising secondary studies ceased at this point, the guiding principles developed were all in agreement with his plan for secondary education. The short-lived life adjustment plan fell under a torrent of criticism and, according to some historians, marked the demise of the progressive education movement. Life adjustment education was attacked for its lack of clearly defined goals which, in addition to new instructional methodologies, often resulted in instructional confusion. It was also criticized for its lack of social significance. Each of these attacks had merit.

Life adjustment education, even as outlined by Prosser in *Secondary Education and Life*, was conceptually weak and hastily implemented. Prosser's justification for this lack of curricular definition--that it was a problem inherent in all new studies--does not belie the fact that it was pedagogically unsound. Prosser was also somewhat bereft of

social insight in that he ignored educational problems specific to a burgeoning immigrant population, the economically deprived, as well as those concerns related to racial issues. Although Prosser believed life adjustment education benefitted society, it was clearly at the expense of the individual.

A final assault on life adjustment education is one still heard today. Accused of anti-intellectualism, Prosser encountered the nation's schizophrenia over the purpose of an education. Whereas the public of his time overtly supported the goal of social utility, its underlying perception was that education provide intellectual training. Today the opposite is true. On the one hand the public demands a return to basic, traditional subjects, that is, intellectual training. However, the underlying belief is that the schools should provide students with socially useful skills--in essence, life preparation training.

Prosser's ideas concerning vocational and life adjustment education provided a forum for which he was able to realize his ideas for each. The educational philosophy that he derived of social utility as attained through vocational training was consistently applied to all educational programs. Just as the *Smith-Hughes Act* brought Prosser's ideas regarding vocational education to fruition and national attention, a similar purpose was achieved in

general high school studies through the Life Adjustment Movement. Prosser's principles of vocational education prevail today and some are still debated.

Prosser's policy of selecting teachers primarily on the basis of their outside work experience became subject to warranted disapproval. While proficiency within content area is of major consequence, it is no more so than teaching skills. Effective instruction relies equally upon both. However, attacks concerning Prosser's practice of preserving identical conditions and procedures in vocational education as those which occur in the working environment were unjustified. These policies, along with his advocacy of short-unit instruction with an emphasis on individualized learning, remain hallmarks of vocational education to this day.

This research has examined Charles Prosser's philosophy of secondary education and its impact on curriculum and instruction. His role as an influential leader in vocational education is undisputable. In the area of general education reform, he served to focus interest and involvement on issues that remain of present concern. In consideration of his significance, relatively little research has been conducted, short of his role in vocational education.

Further related research could include an analysis of Prosser's ideas concerning European educational systems and

the evolution of these ideas. Another study of interest is Prosser's views concerning adult education in terms of application and consistency with similar ideas expressed regarding secondary education. Prosser's views regarding teacher benefits, salaries and labor unions is an additional area yet to be explored. A related topic would be to correlate these views with his perceptions of social agencies. Other topics of study can be ascertained from Prosser's unpublished documents (see Appendix B).

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Unpublished Materials

Bovey, William H. "Director of the William Hood Dunwoody Industrial Institute." In "Charles Allen Prosser: A Testimonial in Recognition of His Service to Vocational Education." By M. Reed Bass, Chairman. Pages Unnumbered. [December] 1933. Typewritten Document. John A. Butler Learning Center, Dunwoody Industrial Institute, Minneapolis.

Buerk, H. A. "The Indiana Career." In "Charles Allen Prosser: A Testimonial in Recognition of His Service to Vocational Education." By M. Reed Bass, Chairman. Pages Unnumbered. [December] 1933. Typewritten Document. John A. Butler Learning Center, Dunwoody Industrial Institute, Minneapolis.

Lapp, John A. "The National Commission." In "Charles Allen Prosser: A Testimonial in Recognition of His Service to Vocational Education." By M. Reed Bass, Chairman. Pages Unnumbered. [December] 1933. Typewritten Document. John A. Butler Learning Center, Dunwoody Industrial Institute, Minneapolis.

New Albany School Board Minutes, 17 August 1908, Document. Stuart Barth Wrege Indiana History Collection, New Albany-Floyd County Public Library, New Albany, Ind.

Prosser, Charles Allen. "Answers to Questions Asked by Dr. M. E. Curti of Smith College." [ca. 1933], Typewritten Document. Special Collection, Dunwoody Industrial Institute, Minneapolis.

_____. "Vocational Education as Life Adjustment." Presentation given to the Wisconsin Educational Association, 1936 or 1937. Typewritten Document. Special Collection, Dunwoody Industrial Institute, Minneapolis.

_____. "Vocational Guidance in Smaller Communities." Address made to Kiwanis Society, 28 January 1938. Typewritten Document. Special Collection, Dunwoody Industrial Institute, Minneapolis.

_____. "The High School and Life." 14 April 1939. Typewritten Document. Special Collection, Dunwoody Industrial Institute, Minneapolis.

_____. "The Future of Occupational Adjustment." Speech given at the National Occupational Conference, Minneapolis, 19 May 1939. Typewritten Document. Special Collection, Dunwoody Industrial Institute, Minneapolis.

_____. "You and Your Mind." Speech given before the National Conference on Trade and Industry and Distributive Education, 14-25 August 1939. Typewritten Document. Special Collection, Dunwoody Industrial Institute, Minneapolis.

_____. "What Type of Teacher Does the Youth of 14-21 Years Need?" Note cards of speech given at Men's Union, [Minneapolis], 20 November 1939. Typewritten Document. Special Collection, Dunwoody Industrial Institute, Minneapolis.

_____. "Essentials in Vocational Training at Mooseheart." Outline of speech given at the Annual Meeting of the Mooseheart Governors, Mooseheart, Ill., 17 November 1944. Typewritten Document. Special Collection, Dunwoody Industrial Institute, Minneapolis.

_____. "Dunwoody's Past Present and Future." 13 April 1945. Typewritten Document. Special Collection, Dunwoody Industrial Institute, Minneapolis.

_____. "Efficient Principles and Practices in Industrial and Trade Education: Memo No. 49." 18 April 1945. Typewritten Document. Special Collection, Dunwoody Industrial Institute, Minneapolis.

_____. "Then and Now: Twenty-eight Years and the Smith-Hughes Act." Address given at the Seventy-fifth Anniversary of the Colorado A. and M. College, 10 July 1945. Typewritten Document. Special Collection, Dunwoody Industrial Institute, Minneapolis.

_____. In the Camp of the Schoolmaster." Commencement address given at Fort Collins Summer School, Colorado State College, 15 August 1945. Typewritten Document. Special Collection, Dunwoody Industrial Institute, Minneapolis.

_____. "The Adjustment of Youth to Life." Statement given at a conference held under the auspices of the U. S. Office of Education, New York, 11-12 April 1946. Typewritten Document. Special Collection, Dunwoody Industrial Institute, Minneapolis.

Snedden, David S. "The Massachusetts Contribution." In "Charles Allen Prosser: A Testimonial in Recognition of His Service to Vocational Education." By M. Reed Bass, Chairman. Pages Unnumbered. [December] 1933. Typewritten Document. John A. Butler Learning Center, Dunwoody Industrial Institute, Minneapolis.

William Hood Dunwoody Industrial Institute. "Prospectus: 1915-1916." Typewritten Manuscript. John A. Butler Learning Center, Dunwoody Industrial Institute, Minneapolis.

Wright, John C. "Director of Federal Board." In Charles Allen Prosser: A Testimonial in Recognition of His Service to Vocational Education." By M. Reed Bass, Chairman. Pages Unnumbered. [December] 1933. Typewritten Document. John A. Butler Learning Center, Dunwoody Industrial Institute, Minneapolis.

Books

Bennett, Charles Alpheus. History of Manual and Industrial Education 1870-1917. Peoria, Ill.: Charles A. Bennett Co., Inc., 1937.

Bestor, Arthur E. Educational Wastelands. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1953.

Cremin, Lawrence A. The Transformation of the School: Progressivism in American Education 1876-1957. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1961; Vintage Books, 1964.

Curti, Merle Eugene. The Social Ideas of American Educators. New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1935.

Dewey, John. The School and Society. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1899.

_____. Democracy and Education. New York: Macmillan, 1916; Free Press, 1966.

_____. Reconstruction in Philosophy. Boston: Beacon Press, 1948; Beacon Paperback Edition, 1957.

Douglass, Harl R., ed. Education for Life Adjustment: Its Meaning and Implementation. New York: Ronald Press, 1950.

Drost, Walter H. David Snedden and Education for Social Efficiency. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1967.

Education Policies Commission. Education for All American Youth. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association and American Association of School Administrators, 1944.

Fine, Sidney. Laissez Faire and the General Welfare State. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1956.

Gates, Arthur I. Psychology for Students of Education. New York: Macmillan, 1924.

Graham, Patricia Albjerg. Progressive Education: From Arcady to Academe. New York: Teachers College Press, 1967.

Gutek, Gerald L. Education in the United States: An Historical Perspective. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1986.

Hansen, Allen Oscar. Liberalism and American Education in the Eighteenth Century. New York: Macmillan, 1926.

Hawkins, Layton S., Charles Allen Prosser, and John C. Wright. Development of Vocational Education. Chicago: American Technical Society, 1951.

Hutchins, Robert M. The Conflict in Education in a Democratic Society. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1953.

Kirkendall, Lester A. "Education for Marriage and Family Living." In Life Adjustment Education in Action: A Symposium, ed. Franklin R. Zeran, 93-115. New York: Chartwell House, Inc., 1953.

Kolesnik, Walter B. Mental Discipline in Modern Education. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1950.

Krug, Edward A. The Shaping of the American High School. New York: Harper and Row, 1964.

Lockwood, George B. New Harmony Movement, with the collaboration of Charles Allen Prosser in the preparation of the educational chapters. New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1905.

Memoirs of the Lower Ohio Valley. Vol. 1. Madison: Federal Publishing Co., 1905.

Ohles, John F., ed. Bibliographical Dictionary of American Educators. Vol. 2. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1978.

"Principles and Policies that Should Underlie State Legislation for a State System of Vocational Education." In The National Society for the Promotion of Industrial Education: Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Meeting Held in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, December 5-7, 1912, Bulletin No. 16. New York: The Society, 1913, 292-97.

Prosser, Charles Allen. "The Training of the Factory Worker." In The National Society for the Promotion of Industrial Education: Proceedings of the Fifth Annual Meeting Held in Cincinnati, Ohio, November 2-4, 1911, Bulletin No. 15. New York: The Society, 1912, 137-55.

_____. "Practical Arts and Vocational Guidance." In Journal of Proceedings and Addresses of the Fiftieth Annual Meeting Held in Chicago, July 6-12, 1912, by the National Education Association. Ann Arbor: National Education Association, 1912, 645-61.

_____. "Annual Report of the Secretary for the Period from April 1st, 1912." In The National Society for the Promotion of Industrial Education: Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Meeting Held in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, December 5-7, 1912, Bulletin No. 16. Peoria, Ill.: Manual Arts Press, 1913, 299-305.

_____. A Study of the Boston Mechanic Arts High School. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1915.

_____. "Vocational Education Under the Smith-Hughes Act." In Addresses and Proceedings of the Fifty-Sixth Annual Meeting Held in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, June 29-July 6, 1918, Vol. LVI, by the National Education Association. Ann Arbor: National Education Association, 1918, 266-68.

_____. Secondary Education and Life. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1939.

_____. The Vocational Advisement of Youth. Fort Collins, Colo.: Colorado A. and M. College, 1945.

Prosser, Charles Allen and Charles R. Allen. Vocational Education in a Democracy. New York: Century Co., 1925.

Prosser, Charles Allen and Charles R. Allen. Have We Kept the Faith?: America at the Cross-Roads in Education. New York: Century Co., 1929.

Prosser, Charles Allen and Thomas H. Quigley. Vocational Education in a Democracy. rev. ed. Chicago: American Technical Society, 1949.

Report of The Commission on Industrial and Technical Education. By Carroll D. Wright, Chairman. New York: Columbia University Teachers College, 1906.

Russell, John Dale. Vocational Education: Staff Study Number 8. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1938.

Smith, Mortimer. And Madly Teach. Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1949.

Snedden, David S. "Differences among Varying Groups of Children Should Be Recognized; and the Period at which This Recognition Takes Place May Rationally Constitute the Beginnings of Secondary Education." In Journal of Proceedings and Addresses of the Forty-Sixth Annual Meeting Held in Cleveland, Ohio, June 29-July 3, 1908, by the National Education Association. Winona, Minn.: National Education Association, 1908, 752-57.

_____. Problems in Educational Readjustment. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1913.

Starch, Daniel. Educational Psychology. New York: Macmillan, 1923.

Articles

Bawden, William T. "Leaders in Industrial Education." Industrial Arts and Vocational Education 41 (September 1952): 169-70.

_____. "Leaders in Industrial Education." Industrial Arts and Vocational Education 41 (October 1952): 259-61.

_____. "Leaders in Industrial Education." Industrial Arts and Vocational Education 42 (January 1953): 10-12.

Camp, William G. "Social Efficiency Revisited: A Cornerstone of the Foundation." Journal of the American Association of Teacher Educators in Agriculture 23 (1982): 35.

_____. "Social Efficiency and Vocational Education: An Examination of Our Changing Philosophies." Journal of Vocational Education Research VIII (Summer 1983): 10-19.

Camp, William G. and John H. Hillison. "Prosser's Sixteen Theorems: A Time for Reconsideration." Journal of Vocational and Technical Education 1 (Fall 1984): 17-18.

Curtis, John W. "The Dunwoody Plan of Continuous Registration of Students." Industrial Education Magazine 5 (November 1931): 133-38.

Dewey, John. "Education vs. Trade-Training." The New Republic, 15 May 1915, 42-43.

Educator Journal 3 (December 1902): 169-70.

Luetkemeyer, Joseph F. "The Snedden/Prosser Social Efficiency Paradigm of Vocational Education." Journal of Industrial Teacher Education 25 (Fall 1987): 31-43.

Prosser, Charles Allen. "Needed Re-Adjustment of Our School System." Educator Journal 3 (February 1903): 236-49.

_____. "Practical Arts and Vocational Guidance." Manual Training Magazine XIV (February 1913): 209-222.

_____. "The Meaning of Industrial Education." Vocational Education (May 1913): 401-410.

_____. "Education as Preparedness." School and Society 3 (June 1916): 796-807.

_____. "The Mission of Art Education in the Public Schools." School and Society 14 (September 1921): 169-74.

Snedden, David S. "The Schools of the Rank and File." Stanford Alumnus I (June 1900): 185-98.

Thorndike, Edward L. "The Opportunity of the High Schools." The Bookman 24 (October 1906): 180-84.

Thorndike, Edward L. and Robert S. Woodworth. "The Influence of Improvement in One Mental Function upon the Efficiency of Other Functions.j" Psychological Review VIII (May 1901): 247-61, 384-95, 553-64.

Wirth, Arthur G. "Issues Affecting Education and Work in the Eighties: Efficiency versus Industrial Democracy, A Historical Perspective." Teachers College Record 79 (September 1977): 55-67.

Yale Faculty. "Original Papers in Relation to a Course of Liberal Education." American Journal of Science and Art XV (January 1829): 297-351.

Government Documents

Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education: A Report of the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education. By Clarence D. Kingsley, Chairman. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1918.

Education for a Changing World of Work: Report of the Panel of Consultants on Vocational Education. By Benjamin C. Willis, Chairman. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1963.

Lovejoy, Owen Reed. "Vocational Guidance and Child Labor." In Present Status of Drawing and Art in the Elementary and Secondary Schools of the United States, ed. Royal Bailey Farnum, 9-16. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1913.

Report of the Commission on National Aid to Vocational Education, Vol. 1. By Hoke Smith, Chairman. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1914.

Report of the Committee on Secondary School Studies. By Charles W. Eliot, Chairman. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1893.

United States Office of Education. Life Adjustment Education for Every Youth. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, [1948].

United States Office of Education. Developing Life Adjustment Education in a Local School. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1949, 3. Quoted in United States Office of Education. Vitalizing Secondary Education: Report of the First Commission on Life Adjustment Education for Youth, 1, Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1951.

United States Office of Education. A Look Ahead in Secondary Education: Report of the Second Commission on Life Adjustment Education for Youth. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1951.

Vocational Education Act. Statutes at Large. Vol. XXXIX (1917).

Dissertations

Gadell, John. "Charles Allen Prosser: His Work in Vocational and General Education." Ph.D. diss., Washington University, 1972.

Greenwood, Katy Lee Brown. "A Philosophic Rationale for Vocational Education: Countributions of Charles A. Prosser and his Contemporaries from 1900 to 1917." Vol. 1 and 2. Ph.D. diss., University of Minnesota, 1978.

APPENDIX A

PROSSER'S SIXTEEN THEORIES OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION[1]

1. Vocational education will be efficient in proportion as the environment in which the learner is trained is a replica of the environment in which he must subsequently work.

2. Effective vocational training can only be given where the training jobs are carried on in the same way with the same operations, the same tools and the same machines as in the occupation itself.

3. Vocational education will be effective in proportion as it trains the individual directly and specifically in the thinking habits and the manipulative habits required in the occupation itself.

4. Vocational education will be effective in proportion as it enables each individual to capitalize his interests, aptitudes and intrinsic intelligence to the highest possible degree.

5. Effective vocational education for any profession, calling, trade, occupation or job can only be given to the selected group of individuals who need it, want it and are able to profit by it.

6. Vocational training will be effective in proportion as the specific training experiences for forming right habits become fixed to the degree necessary for gainful employment.

7. Vocational education will be effective in proportion as the instructor has had successful experience in the application of skills and knowledge to the operations and processes he undertakes to teach.

8. For every occupation there is a minimum of productive ability which an individual must possess in order to secure or retain employment in that occupation. If vocational education is not carried to that point with that individual, it is neither personally nor socially effective.

---

[1] Charles Allen Prosser and Charles R. Allen, Vocational Education in a Democracy (New York: The Century Co., 1925), 194-209.

9. Vocational education must recognize conditions as they are and must train individuals to meet the demands of the "market" even though it may be true that more efficient ways of conducting the occupation may be known and that better working conditions are highly desirable.

10. The effective establishment of process habits in any learner will be secured in proportion as the training is given on actual jobs and not on exercises or pseudo jobs.

11. The only reliable source of content for specific training in an occupation is in the experiences of masters of that occupation.

12. For every occupation there is a body of content which is peculiar to that occupation and which practically has no functioning value in any other occupation.

13. Vocational education will render efficient social service in proportion as it meets the specific training needs of any group at the time that they need it and in such a way that they can most effectively profit by the instruction.

14. Vocational education will be socially efficient in proportion as in its methods of instruction and its personal relations with learners it takes into consideration the particular characteristics of any particular group which it serves.

15. The administration of vocational education will be efficient in proportion as it is elastic and fluid rather than rigid and standardized.

16. While every reasonable effort should be made to reduce per capita cost, there is a minimum below which effective vocational education cannot be given, and if the course does not permit of this minimum of per capita cost, vocational education should not be attempted.

APPENDIX B

SELECTED ADDRESSES OF CHARLES PROSSER[1]

Adjustment of Youth to Life
Alleged Foolproof Check Sheets
Anticipated Needs for Instruction: Work of Apprentices, 1944
Army/Navy--Industrial Tool and Die Workers
Atlanta
Baker and New Laws
Broadcast--Association of Industries
Broadcast from Buffalo
Broadcast from Labor Temple
Broadcast from Wausau, WI
Changing Conditions and the American Home
Conditions and the Indentured Apprenticeship, 1941
Conditions of Effective Apprenticeship, 1945
Conservation of Trade Skills
Cooperation between Minneapolis Employers and Dunwoody Institute
Crippled Child and Spirit of America
Daytona Beach, 1939
Decay of Personal Integrity
Dissipation of Trade and Industrial Skills and Knowledge
Diversified Occupations
Dr. John C. Wright
Dunwoody's Cooperation with Better Homes and Heating
Education that Prepares for Life
Essentials in Vocational Training at Mooseheart, 1944
Essentials of Vocational Training at Mooseheart
Facts about Dunwoody Institute
Facts about State Regulations of Private Schools Offered for Profit
Foreman and the Apprentice
Future of Occupational Adjustment
Getting a Job
Hawaii--America's Newest Frontier
High School and Life (Inglis Lecture)
In the Company of the School Master
Industry and New Laws
It Can Happen Here
Labor Saving Machine
Leadership in Employee/Employer Relations
Lessons for Us All
Machine and Vocational Education, 1931
Memorial Day Address, 1937

---

[1] Documents are contained in a special collection at the Dunwoody Industrial Institute, Minneapolis.

Milestones in Industrial and Trade Education
Minnesota and the Indentured Apprentice
National Association of Trade School Principals
National Conference of Trade and Industrial Supervisors
New Jobs for Displaced Workers
Northwest and the Philippine Questions
Parents and Safety
Phi Delta Theta, 1940
Priest: Arthur Ragan
Prosser Memorial Address, Colorado College, 1938
Prosser Plan: Peaceable Adjustment of Employer/Employee Labor Disputes
Recent Social Legislation
Recruiting and Training of Machine Workers
Report on Private Trade School Committee
Salesmanship in a Machine Age
Six Living Governors
Six O'Clock Club Address--Labor Problems, 1936
Summer School, Colorado State, 1938
Then and Now, 1942
Then and Now, 1945
Training Defense Workers
Training Factory Workers Through Vocational Education
Training within Industry
Tragedy of the German Worker
Tragedy of the Unprepared
Vocational Adjustment at Mooseheart
Vocational Education and the Changing Conditions of Employment
Vocational Education as Life Adjustment
Vocational Education in Penal Institutes
Vocational Guidance in Smaller communities
Washington the Engineer
What a High School Pupil Should Know about Occupations
What Hitler Has Done to Agricultural Workers, 1941
What Hitler Has Done to Businessmen Big and Small
What Hitler Has Done to Industrial Workers, 1941
What Hitler Has Done to Women, 1941
What Lies Ahead
What Vocational Advisement is Needed by Youth
When Battle Flags are Furled
Where Do We Go From Here
You and Your Mind

APPROVAL SHEET

The dissertation submitted by Roberta Silver has been read and approved by the following committee:

Dr. Gerald L. Gutek
Professor, Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, Loyola University of Chicago

Dr. Joan K. Smith, Director
Professor, Educational Leadership and Policy Studies; and Associate Dean, Graduate School, Loyola University of Chicago

Dr. John M. Wozniak
Professor Emeritus, Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, Loyola University of Chicago

The final copies have been examined by the director of the dissertation and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and that the dissertation is now given final approval by the Committee with reference to content and form.

The dissertation is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

October 25, 1990 — Date

Gerald L. Gutek — Director's Signature